JPRS-TAC-86-004

9 January 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

JPRS-TAC-86-004

9 January 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Heseltine Establishes SDI Participation Office
(Tom McMullan; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 6 Dec 85) 1

FRG SDI Involvement Seen as Harmful to Relations With Poland
(Warsaw PAP, 30 Dec 85) 4

PRC Journal Comments on Results of U.S.-USSR Summit
(Tan Ping; Beijing BAN YUE TAN, No 23, 10 Dec 85) 5

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

IZVESTIYA Editorial Article Examines Post-Summit Arms Stance
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 24 Dec 85) 6

USSR's 'Top Priority' Program Views Summit Results
(Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow in English to North America, 14 Dec 85) 9

Moscow TV Details Importance of Progress Following Summit
(Feodor Burlatskiy; Moscow Television Service, 8 Dec 85). 13

'Faked' U.S. Report on Arms Violations Criticized
(Various sources, various dates) 15

'Anti-Soviet Song and Dance' 15
Report Features 'Distortion' 16
'Fabrications' on Arms Issues, by Vitaliy Gan 17

USSR Reports Press Conference on Arms Race
(Various sources, various dates) 19

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Coverage 19
Arbatov, Velikhov Remarks 23
Velikhov Interviewed 25

USSR's Gen Lebedev Evaluates Strategic Parity
(Yu. Lebedev; Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 18 Dec 85) ... 27

TASS: 'Angry' Lord Carrington Criticizes NATO Allies
(Moscow TASS, 19 Dec 85) 30

Soviet Commentary on NATO Foreign Ministers' Session
(Various sources, various dates) 32

'Allegiance to Former Militaristic Course',
by Yuriy Solton 32
U.S. 'Resorted to Blackmail', by Sergey Lebedev 33

Shevardnadze Speech at Luncheon for Romanian Foreign Minister
(Moscow TASS International Service, 24 Dec 85) 35

SALT-START ISSUES

USSR: U.S. Intentions for SALT II Treaty Remain in Doubt
(Various sources, 24 Dec 85) 38

Official Renunciation Demanded 38
Possible Review of U.S. Decision 39

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS Views Romanian, Bulgarian Balkans Appeal for NFZ
(Moscow TASS, 25 Dec 85) 40

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: U.S., Allies Hamper Progress at CDE Session
(Moscow TASS, 10 Dec 85) 41

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. Continues Nuclear Explosions Despite Ban
(Valentin Zorin; Moscow in English to North America,
14 Dec 85) 42

Soviet Comment on U.S. Response to USSR's New Moratorium
(Various sources, various dates) 43

U.S. 'Does Not Agree to Idea' 43
U.S. 'Propaganda Stunt' 43
U.S. Blasts Continue, by Valentin Zorin 44
U.S. Nuclear Explosion Postponed 45
'Moment of Truth' Arises, by Valeriy Korzin 45
U.S. Shows 'Unwillingness' 46
Speakes Announces Refusal 47
Speakes Remarks Deplored, by V. Gan 48
'Deceitful' Maneuver, by V. Matveyev 49
'Sincerity' in 'Doubt' 50
Time for 'Responsible Decision', by Aleksandr Zholkver 51
'Omen' of Test Postponement, by V. Nikolayev 52

USSR Notes Foreign Reaction to Soviet Proposal
(Moscow TASS, various dates) 53

Hungary's Varkonyi 53
Bulgarian Deputy Defense Minister 53
Pugwash Movement Statement 54

TASS: Adelman Rejects Proposal To End Nuclear Testing
(Moscow TASS, 16 Dec 85) 55

TASS Cites U.S. Organization's Appeal for Moratorium
(Moscow TASS, 11 Nov 85) 56

USSR Reports, Comments on Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone Conference
(Various sources, various dates) 57

Conference Opens 57
TASS Cites Speeches 58
Nordic Parliamentarians Call for NFZ 59
Kuznetsov Commentary, by Yuriy Kuznetsov 60

TASS on French Nuclear Test on Mururoa
(Moscow TASS, various dates) 62

South Pacific Condemns Test 62
Australian Protest 62

TASS: U.S. Presses New Zealand To Change Policy
(Moscow TASS, 16 Dec 85) 63

TASS: 638 Japanese Areas Declared Nuclear-Free Zones
(Moscow TASS, 5 Nov 85) 64

Briefs

Socialist States Present Resolution at UN 65

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: 'International Situation--Questions and Answers', 13 December
(Pavel Kasparov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 13 Dec 85) 66

Summit 'Certain Success' 66
SDI Plans 66
'NATO Marathon' 70

PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events, 15 December
(Boris Averchenko; Moscow PRAVDA, 15 Dec 85) 71

USSR Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable', 15 December
(Igor Pavlovich Charikov, et al.; Moscow Domestic
Service, 15 Dec 85) 74

Geneva Summit 74
NATO Discussions 75

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

HESELTINE ESTABLISHES SDI PARTICIPATION OFFICE

LD061402 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1323 GMT 6 Dec 85

[By PA political correspondent Tom McMullan]

[Text] Britain today took the first significant step among America's main allies in the development of President Reagan's proposed "star wars" technology.

Under the glare of television lights and with the flags of the two countries mounted behind them, Defence Secretary Michael Heseltine and U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger signed a memorandum of understanding at a ceremony at the Ministry of Defence in London.

The memorandum -- which is not being published -- is said to set out the mechanisms for British participation in research for the "star wars" policy known as the Strategic Defence Initiative.

Mr Heseltine told MP's in a written Commons answer: "To act as a focal point for British participation and to liaise with the United States Strategic Defence Initiative Office, an SDI Participation Office is being established within the Ministry of Defence immediately.

"This office will work in the closest concert with British companies and institutions in participating in SDI research."

Observers considered that Britain's action was politically bound to be highly controversial.

Opposition leader Mr Neil Kinnock said in a statement that the project was "deluded, destabilising and dangerous." Britain's involvement would spark a brain-drain, he said. "It is the British technologists that the United States wants, not the British technology."

Even though it is stressed that Britain is cooperating on research, the Whitehall move was being interpreted by observers as support for the project. The Soviet Union is mounting a major propaganda campaign against the whole "star wars" idea.

At a press conference which followed the signing ceremony it was made clear that there was no guarantee of contracts for British companies.

Mr Heseltine said that British companies would have to compete on quality and price.

But Mr Weinberger said during the news conference: "I have every confidence there will be substantial awards made to British companies or consortia including British companies.

"There are a number of contracts pending. There are certain areas in which British skills are particularly recognized. There are to be a lot of contracts in that area."

Areas where British research could be useful included laser research, computerisation capability and weather effects on laser beams. He was pleased that the first of these cooperation agreements had been signed with the United Kingdom. "That emphasises the closeness of our alliance and the special nature of our relationship, which is a very vital thing to both countries."

He added: "There is a very strong desire to have British participation in the programme. That has been expressed by me many times and by my government. That will prevail. I have no doubt about the laboratory work -- that there will be major awards as we continue to go ahead with the programme."

Mr Heseltine commented: "This is a very significant opportunity for British industry and for British research capability to be associated with a major programme.

"The understanding will provide opportunities for British companies to go out and win contracts. It will bring a significant number of jobs to this country."

Asked about specific commitments in the memorandum of understanding, he said the research programme was important in itself because of the wider exploration of technologies that was opened up.

But for Britain, with high technology base, it was necessary to play a part in the defence programme.

Mr Heseltine added: "I fully understood that there would be no flow of blank dollar cheques. There would be a process of making awards. That would be a process of competition. It will depend on quality and price."

However, it had been made clear that Britain would expect a substantial involvement in the programme -- it did not want only relatively small contracts on the frontiers of research.

There were 18 areas of technology in which British had a contribution to make which were spelled out in the memorandum and would be available to industrialists concerned.

The SDI Participation Office

Asked what guarantees there were that the technology would not find its way into the hands of other governments, Mr Weinberger replied: "The ability to hold it depends on the precautions we all take." It was up to "all of us" to take precautions to prevent the Soviets from acquiring such technology.

"We will take every precaution to hold it and I have every confidence Britain will do the same thing."

Asked whether today's deal would accelerate negotiations on similar agreements with West Germany and Italy, he said he had no way of knowing what other governments would do.

Mr Heseltine said it had not been known until this morning whether the detailed negotiations would be concluded.

The agreement was signed after overnight instructions from joint teams working in London and Washington.

"We were delighted to take the opportunity of Mr Weinberger's presence here to sign the agreement," he added.

/9365
CSO: 5240/017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG SDI INVOLVEMENT SEEN AS HARMFUL TO RELATIONS WITH POLAND

LD302310 Warsaw PAP in English 2017 GMT 30 Dec 85

["FRG 'Star Wars' Decision: Going Upstream"--PAP headline; by PAP journalist]

[Text] Warsaw, Dec 30 -- The Soviet side (?never) fails to take any opportunity to make the Bonn (?ruling) circles realize that every case of the FRG's involving in the American "star wars" project hits out at detente in Europe. Whatever the motive behind the possible involvement, it will do no good to European relations. Soviet warnings in this regard have been unambiguous from the very start. This taken into account, the latest statement by the Soviet Foreign Ministry comes as no sensation.

The charges levelled by the first press comments in the FRG, to the effect that the Soviet statement "constitutes an interference in internal affairs of another state" aim at averting the public attention from the heart of the matter. Issues regarding war and peace, peaceful coexistence in Europe or mass annihilation are by no means an internal affair of any country. Besides, such an accusation is strange inasmuch as it is being levelled by a press which has been constantly interfering in the purely internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

What the Bonn press should rather do is concentrate on the FRG Government's ignoring both international and its own public opinion, since most of the country's citizens come out against the "star wars."

One can say with no exaggeration that no military decision taken in the FRG so far has met with such a meagre support and aroused so many protests as the one concerning the start of talks with the United States on the FRG's joining the programme of adventurist space armaments. And so Bonn is going against the current again.

/8309
CSO: 5200/3021

PRC JOURNAL COMMENTS ON RESULTS OF U.S.-USSR SUMMIT

HK191021 Beijing BAN YUE TAN in Chinese No 23, 10 Dec 85 pp 52-55

[Article by Tan Ping: "Though the Results Are Limited, They Are Still Welcome--Commenting on the U.S.-Soviet Summit Meeting"]

[Excerpts] U.S. President Reagan and CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev held talks on 19 and 20 November in Geneva, Switzerland.

In their 15 hours of talks during the 2 days, both the Soviet and American leaders admitted that no one could win a nuclear war, so there should never be a nuclear war. Both sides expressed their willingness to cooperate in reducing nuclear weapons, preventing nuclear proliferation, improving their "hot line" links, dismantling chemical weapons, promoting the talks on reducing nuclear arms in the East and in the West, and expanding cultural exchanges and restoring civil aviation links. In fact, the two countries had made such statements in the past and had discussed some points for several decades. They merely reiterated what they had said previously at the summit meetings, and these common points could not be regarded as substantial progress in U.S.-Soviet relations.

At the meeting, the two sides did not change a bit their respective positions on the issue of the "star wars" program. Reagan especially had a strong aversion to the term "star wars" and he did not allow reporters to use this term. He insisted that his plan is called the "Strategic Defense Initiative," which will pose no threat at all and will not be realized until the distant future. At the meeting, Gorbachev sharply pointed out that the "star wars" program will send weapons into outer space, so it is not defensive in nature. Not only would it intensify the arms race, but it would make the Soviet Union lose all her restraint. He said that if the United States abandons this program, the Soviet Union would be ready to open all of her laboratories for inspection so as to prove that the Soviet Union does not research any space weapons. The United States, however, demanded that the Soviet Union first open its laboratories for inspection. Gorbachev told Reagan that he was no fool, and that if Reagan persisted in his "star wars" program, he would have to take corresponding action. Obviously, there was no room for the two sides to discuss this issue.

After the meeting, the United States and the Soviet Union did not conceal their differences. Gorbachev said that the two sides could not reach agreement on the most important issues of the arms race and raised hopes for peace, and that great differences still existed on some issues of principle. Reagan said that the task of really improving U.S.-Soviet relations remained very arduous. He told the Congress: "I cannot say that our views are basically identical." U.S. national security adviser McFarlane said that the most important result of the meeting was that both sides gained a rather thorough understanding of the other side's intentions, priorities, and wishes for compromise.

/6091
CSO: 5200/4016

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL ARTICLE EXAMINES POST-SUMMIT ARMS STANCE

PM231630 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Living and Acting According to the Geneva Mandate"]

[Text] It is a month since the day the Geneva meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan ended. A considerable period -- according to the criteria of our swift-moving time. But the dialogue that was held on the shores of Lake Geneva still remains the center of world attention.

All peoples on earth awaited this dialogue with concern and hope. Have the expectations been vindicated? Even now, a month after the meeting, no simple answer can be asserted that the overall balance of Geneva is positive. Positive both for bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations and for the international situation as a whole.

At the same time, it has to be admitted that as of yet Geneva merely offers a chance of breaking the dangerous development of events in the world. It was not possible to find a solution beneath Swiss skies to the most important questions connected with the task of ending the arms race and consolidating peace. Major disagreements on fundamental issues still remain between the USSR and the United States. Above all, on issues connected with the security sphere, which, as the CPSU Central Committee Politburo stressed 25 November, is and will be the determining factor in Soviet-U.S. relations.

The nucleus of this sphere is the problem of preventing the militarization of space and of reducing nuclear weapons in their organic connection. When going to the Geneva summit the Soviet Union proposed to the United States, first of all, entirely banning space strike arms. Explaining its position on this issue, Moscow asserted and continues to assert that the creation of a space "shield" will make nuclear weapons even more dangerous. The entry into service [prinyatiye na vooruzheniye] of space strike means can only cause a new explosion of the arms race in all directions, transform the present strategic parity into strategic chaos, and sharply intensify the threat of a global nuclear conflict.

It would be criminally irresponsible to allow the military-political situation in the world to continue its slide toward the abyss. But the slide into uncontrollable confrontation will not stop spontaneously. A reliable barrier must be placed in its way.

Fulfilling its duty to mankind, our country is putting forward a profoundly well-reasoned, comprehensive, and, most importantly, realistic program for specific action.

The Soviet Union has proposed -- provided that there is a total ban on space strike arms -- that all the USSR's and the United States' existing nuclear means capable of reaching one another's territories be halved and that the total number of nuclear charges on them on each side be limited to a ceiling of 6,000 units. It was emphasized here that the Soviet side would regard the halving of the USSR's and the United States' nuclear means as the start of a process which could culminate -- and our country is ready for this (given that the other nuclear states join in this process too, of course) -- in the total destruction of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union also put forward proposals according, in the Soviet side's conviction, with the hopes of Europe's peoples for a lessening of the nuclear threat.

In one of the three spheres of the talks -- space, strategic offensive arms,and medium-range nuclear means -- is the USSR proposing anything that would reduce U.S. security.

Moreover, the Soviet Union's military doctrine has as one of its cornerstones the conscious renunciation of changing the strategic balance in its own favor and to the detriment of the United States, since the emergence of such a situation can only intensify the other side's suspiciousness and increase the instability of the overall situation in the world.

The USSR's consistent constructive policy made it possible to outline in Geneva some points of contact on the problem of preventing an arms race in space and curtailing it on earth. However, the main obstacle to resolving this fundamental issue -- the U.S. "star wars" program -- remains.

The month since Geneva has brought no indications of any changes in Washington's attitude to the "star wars" program. And, in turn, this does not make it possible to claim yet that the United States intends to be serious about the task whose resolution even R. Reagan proclaimed in Geneva to be one of the goals of U.S. foreign policy: preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth.

Moreover, the events of recent days create the firm impression that people on the banks of the Potomac intend to implement the "star wars" program at an accelerated pace, involving in it the scientific, technical, and industrial potential of their NATO allies -- Britain and the FRG -- and compelling Japan and other countries to become involved in implementing SDI. Thus, the attainment of the goal of the nonmilitarization of space is only complicated and the consequences of the transfer of the arms race to space -- which are already visible today, but have so far been confined to the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations -- are beginning to take on global outlines.

The U.S. commitment -- proclaimed by President R. Reagan in Geneva -- to the abandonment of attempts to achieve superiority over the USSR in the military sphere as yet finds no corroboration in the question of ending nuclear weapons test.

Such a step by all the nuclear powers would contribute to the complete withering away of nuclear arsenals in the long term. It is precisely for this reason that the USSR unilaterally announced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions until 1 January 1986 in the hope that its example would be followed by other countries, above all, the United States. Given reciprocity on the part of Washington, our country is prepared to extend the moratorium.

But the United States is showing no readiness to join the Soviet Union. The United States prefers to improve nuclear weapons rather than eliminate them. And each successive nuclear explosion is further confirmation that Washington is preparing for "star wars" not "in order to destroy nuclear arsenals," but in order to strengthen its own first strike potential.

The U.S. Administration is still tempted to achieve military superiority. Empty ventures! It was reaffirmed with the utmost responsibility in Geneva that the USSR will not permit the United States to achieve military superiority over it; either on earth or in space.

Therefore, would it not be more sensible to use the current real chance to sharply lessen the threat of nuclear war and then, totally remove it? To miss this opportunity would be an irreparable mistake: Even today the arms race is increasing the degree of unpredictability of events and a further "technologization" [tekhnologizatsiya] of the means of waging war may take the possibility of a universal catastrophe out of the hands of reason altogether, leaving the peoples at the mercy of a semiconductor defect or a computer error.

Geneva still makes it possible to avoid such a catastrophe and still gives mankind a cance of surviving. That chance can and must be taken.

To that end it is necessary, first and foremost, to strictly adhere to the accords reached in Geneva, refraining from actions capable of making those accords merely an empty noise. Furthermore, it is necessary to take no actions capable in one way or another of blocking talks on nuclear and space arms. These talks themselves must really be talks aimed at achieving specific agreed goals and not a justification and camouflage of the arms race. The spirit of Geneva also demands honest and strict observance of the ABM Treaty and reciprocal observance by the sides of the provisions of the SALT II Treaty.

But the main thing is to create the possibility for really ending the arms race and finally embarking on practical steps to reduce nuclear arsenals. However must Soviet and U.S. proposals on these problems may differ, those differences are surmountable.

All these tasks, however, can be effectively resolved on one condition: if the door through which weapons can reach space is tightly closed. Otherwise, no radical nuclear arms reductions are possible.

Geneva opened up the way for the expansion and consolidation of Soviet-U.S. contacts, including at summit level. But a purely formal approach to the organization of such dialogues is impermissible. It is necessary to prepare for the next summit right now; primarily in the sphere of practical policy.

It is mainly a question of little things. It is necessary to mobilize political will and direct it toward turning words into deeds in order to respon with deeds to the peoples' aspirations. Courage is needed for a new and fresh approach to foreign policy which would ditch false, old-style conceptions of "national interests." It is necessary to become accustomed to strategic parity as the natural state of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The transition to the new positions dictated by the qualitatively new situation in the world is not simple, but it is necessary. "The acuteness of the times we are living through," M.S. Gorbachev stressed, "leaves Soviet and U.S. leaders and the Soviet and U.S. peoples with no alternative but to learn the great science of living together." Geneva issued a mandate for that science to be learned. Now we have only to start living and acting according to the Geneva mandate. The Soviet Union is prepared to do that.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S 'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM VIEWS SUMMIT RESULTS

LD150431 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 14 Dec 85

["Top Priority" program on Geneva summit results moderated by Vladimir Posner with Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov from the United States of America and Canada Institute; on 13 December -- recorded]

[Text] Hello everyone, this is Vladimir Posner presenting "Top Priority." With me today [13 December] are our usual contributors, Dr Radomir Bogdanov, Dr Sergey Plekhanov, both of the Institute of USA and Canada Studies. Well, it's been a while since we have been together and in that while some very important things have happened; the most important of course being the meeting, the summit meeting in Geneva, between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

Obviously, that sets the theme for today's discussion, which is the results and what they mean. Now I'd like to remind you that at our last "Top Priority" meeting we discussed Geneva on the eve and we were somehat pessimistic. I was, I believe Dr Bogdanov also was, and Dr Plekhanov preferred not to say anything about it. Well, Geneva is now done with. What do you feel happened and what do you think the results mean? Who'd like to begin? Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Vladimir, let me begin with some preliminary remarks. Number one, I am very happy that we are back around this table again and let me flatter Vladimir a little bit, you as our moderator, because as usual you have taken a wise decision. You didn't invite us just the next day after Geneva. You have waited for some time and I understand why. Now today we have clearer picture and we may have some deeper thoughts on Geneva, on its meaning. So now I, my second point, is that really today after so many days and weeks after Geneva we may think on that in quite a usual environment and as I told you last time if I am wrong I would be ready to state it publicly. But I believe that I was half-wrong, not completely wrong and half-wrong you know, because I was not very much enthusiastic. I was little pessimistic and you know what is the most important thing, that at last it has happened. That is the real event. And now I believe that the meeting itself of the leaders of the two states was important by itself. It didn't achieve some concrete results we have expected. In that I am still pessimistic.

But what it did achieve is it cleared the atmosphere. And I believe that our -- we became more secure than before. We became more self-assured that we were on the right way. But that rather belongs to the notion of fate, which is something very, not objective, which is something you cannot touch, you cannot, you just cannot feel it, but I believe that the most important thing now, just to keep spirit of Geneva alive, because on that ground you can build up real things, just to develop, to work on spirit of Geneva. Don't you agree with me Sergey? That now that is the most important thing?

[Plekhanov] That is right. I think Geneva is important first because it drew a line under certain developments, and secondly because it set the stage for a new process in Soviet-American relations. As the drawing a line and kind of updating, to just drawing the line, it is important that the two leaders recognize, number one the need to improve Soviet-American relations, to seek common ground actively wherever that is possible, given all the serious differences that exist between the two countries, this is the only way to go, by reducing distrust, increasing mutual understanding, and finding common ground on as many issues as possible. Secondly, it was important that the problems of security, of war and peace, the arms race and arms control, were the central issue in Geneva. And this reflects the objective situation between the two countries.

Really, no other issue is more important than the issue of security. There were several important doctrinal points agreed upon and included in the joint statement by Secretary General Gorbachev and President Reagan: Number one, it's the statement that nuclear war can never be won, must never be fought. And it's good that this statement has been made on the top level and reflects a consensus on both sides, and we are more than happy to see that confirmed by the Reagan Administration, which in the past used to express a different attitude toward nuclear war.

Then, I think it's important that the two leaders stressed that everything must be done in order to prevent any sort of armed clashes between the two sides, and kind of war, nuclear or conventional, and some specific measures were proposed to that effect. The two sides have agreed to speed up the process of arms control talks. They have directed their delegations at Geneva, at the Geneva talks which have been going on since January, to speed up that process.

They have compared the positions of the two sides on limiting offensive nuclear, on reducing offensive nuclear weapons, and they have come to the conclusion that there are points of convergence there and that work can be, can proceed toward working out an agreement.

[Posner] Let me, let me interrupt there for just 1 minute. As I see what you two gentlemen are saying, Dr Bogdanov is speaking about an intangible but very important spirit that has been created by the meeting in Geneva. You are talking more about the concrete agreements that were reached that are of importance in concrete areas, which is a slightly different thing, but also certainly positive. What I would like you both now to share your views on is: What now, where do we go? Please.

[Bogdanov] Yes, I'm sorry Vladimir. I agree with Sergey that of course we, we've got a couple of concrete things in the joint statement, but my problem is if the American side is really ready -- I would put it like that, is really ready, to carry on those concrete things agreed upon in the statement -- and my difficulty is that I am not sure that American side, and when I say American side I mean the American political establishment, political mechanism; are they ready to carry on that policy into practical steps? That is my difficulty and my worry. And to be frank with you, since you put that very important question, is that they are not yet ready. Let me put it like that, that any, any, any president, any, any American President, even as powerful as Reagan is and as President Reagan is popular, he needs a consensus but my problem is are they building up this consensus or not around Geneva policy. By the way, I believe that we are entitled to use now and in the future that term "Geneva policy". Now my question is, how long it will last or will it survive, you know.

[Posner interrupting] Yes.

[Bogdanov continuing] That's my problem.

[Posner] On August 6, if you recall, the Soviet Government took what I consider to be and what most people would agree here is a very important initiative. It unilaterally announced the stop of all nuclear tests. This was in a way a signal, how we were looking forward to Geneva, the kinds of things we were ready to do. And if you recall, the Soviet Government said that it would unilaterally stop all nuclear tests until the 1st of January 1986. Now that is not far away. And I am thinking in the terms of what Dr Bogdanov said, if there is some kind of gesture that the United States might make to signal that indeed the spirit of Geneva or the Geneva policy is something that will continue, I would see it as taking up the Soviet example. Now what do you think about that and about what Dr Bogdanov said, and about the future?

[Plekhanov] Well I agree very much that joining the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests would be a very specific and not really any ground-shaking step that the United States Government could take, without jeopardizing its security posture or anything, but it could take that step in order to show that it is serious about those things which it signed in the joint statement in Geneva. I agree with Dr Bogdanov that the problem now is to put those words into deeds. You see, before Geneva, in the months leading up to Geneva, the U.S. Government took quite a few steps which really looked like an attempt if not to derail the process leading up to the summit, then to minimize the specific results that could be achieved at the, at the Geneva summit conference, and refusal to join the moratorium and in fact challenging the moratorium by resuming the program of nuclear testing, was one of those very unpleasant and unconstructive things that were done by the U.S. side before Geneva. And in fact we now know for a fact that there are people in the administration, in the Reagan Administration, who are very unhappy about the fact that Geneva ever took place.

[Posner interrupting]..Very interesting point.

[Plekhanov continuing] And they now are, they are still in the administration, they are now working full time in order to dissipate the spirit of Geneva in order to kill the process, or at least to make it as empty as possible.

[Posner] I'd like to take up on that little point, but a very important point you make concerning people in the American establishment, high-up government level, who are basically, who were, are, and probably will be, basically against the spirit of Geneva. Now do you think that they will prove to be a very serious kind of stumble-block?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, it's not my difficulty, people in the administration, I believe that Reagan himself, being very powerful President, if he likes it he can control them. That, that is not my difficulty. My difficulty is with his political base, with his supporters outside the administration, within the Republican Party, within the Congressional Republican caucus, and things like that, you know. As usual, what happens, by one hand they talk to us, by the other hand they are so (?shy) with their own people that they demonstrate to them: No, we are not benign to Russians, we are very harsh to them, and they are going to demonstrate that by what -- by resuming our tests. So, as a student of American politics for the last 25 years, to be frank with you, I am not surprised. But that is usual, the so-called balance in between different forces within the political establishment. What worries me, what Sergey put it already, and you said it already, that in that game you may always over-play, over-play to such an extent that you will kill small, very modest positive results of Geneva, just to please the other domestic political interests.

[Posner] With time running out, I'd like to ask you Dr Plekhanov with your view on this what the future may hold for us, and whether or not you have an equally, shall we say, bleak view of what may happen? How do you feel?

[Plekhanov] Well I think that the struggles around U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union are far from over. They were brought to the fore in connection with the Geneva summit and I think the publication of the letter by Secretary Weinberger on the eve of Geneva which was interpreted by one of the people on the President's team as an attempt to sabotage the summit.

That's pretty harsh language, and the fact of the publication shows that there are differences, and there are conflicts within the administration,even if the administration doesn't, prefers not to recognize it. And I think the conflict is quite obvious to everybody who wants to see, because the administration is trying to ride two horses at the same time. Number one, it wants to continue its traditional policy of trying to acquire military superiority over the Soviet Union,to pressure the Soviet Union, to sort of try to build an anti-Soviet coalition on a global scale, and so on, to deny the Soviet Union the equal right to exist as a political power of major, a major political power. On the otherhand, it has been forced to recognize that you can't really deal with the Soviet Union on such a basis.

So, these two processes are very difficult to combine. One has to choose. If the administration follows in the direction laid out in Geneva, then I think that we will not only improve Soviet-American relations, but also provide for a success of the Reagan administration's foreign policy. At the same time I don't think that the road of further arms race, increased confrontation, is a road to success for the U.S. Government. Really I think Geneva clearly made that very clear, and I think this is what the world expects of the U.S. Government, to follow in the spirit of Geneva down the road of specific achievement.

[Posner] That's quite ture, I think the world does expect that, I think we all hope for that, but I don't believe that it is possible without solving the problem "star wars." Now you've certainly noticed that I did not bring up that issue today. And the reason I didn't is because it demands an in-depth appraisal, it demands probably an entire issue of "Top Priority." Indeed, it is a top priority subject. Without solving star wars there is not going to be any kind of true development of what people are calling the spirit of Geneva. Without making it absolutely guaranteed that space will not be militarized, there can be no real progress. I think that is something that should be said with the utmost clarity, absolutely unequivocally. That is the major problem to the improvement of relations, and it is the key to disarmament. Let us make that clear to one and all. And having said that, let me say goodbye to all the listeners of "Top Priority" until we meet again.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

MOSCOW TV DETAILS IMPORTANCE OF PROGRESS FOLLOWING SUMMIT

LD082207 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Dec 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Feodor Burlatskiy]

[Text] Quite a few noises connected with worries about the further course of talks on the key issues of limiting the arms race can be heard in the amicable chorus of Geneva summit approval. Nothing can be more dangerous for a new reality than an old delusion. This applies to those, who up until now have been inclined, in their struggle for strengthening national security, to rely not on joint action in arms limitation, but on unleashing a further arms race.

This relates above all to the supporters of the SDI program, which has become, according to universal opinion, the main obstacle on the path toward arms race limitation. Well, as Voltaire said, minds perfect themselves slowly; we have enough patience to attempt to break the dangerous course of events step by step, acting by force of argument, force of example, and common sense.

Yet another thought comes to mind in connection with the Geneva meeting outcome analysis. It is not sufficient to carry out a successful political dialogue and to adopt important decisions. A consistent implementation of the accord confirmed in the declaration and further progress on this path will now acquire a huge importance.

Of course now, following the wave of a certain euphoria over the results of the Geneva meeting which gripped the whole world, it is to be expected that in the United States and other Western countries, the supporters of a continuation of confrontation will switch on their engines at full power. They are trying with all their might to belittle the significance of what has been achieved. They will attempt to take revenge in the mass media, which have been generally and on the whole acting in a constructive spirit during the Geneva period. There will certainly also be those who will not give up the temptation to interpret the results of the meeting in a primitive way, as a victory of one side and defeat of the other.

The other day, two U.S. specialists on the issues of Soviet-U.S. relations came to my editorial office. I met one of them in Geneva, where he was present as an expert. They wanted to discuss issues of the further development of cooperation between us was raised; in economic, scientific and technological, cultural, humanitarian and other spheres. In this connection, I voiced quite an optimistic view. I referred to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statements in Geneva and here in Moscow on the broad possibilities for the development of such cooperation -- on a mutually advantageous basis, of course -- and even to the possibility of the implementation of major joint projects.

I also referred to the arrival of a large group -- some 300 people -- of U.S. businessmen in Moscow, due in a few days' time. To my astonishment the U.S. specialists did not share my optimism and said that real progress on this path will become possible only after the military and political issues have been resolved.

And so, once again there is this notorious, linkage, as the Americans say, that is, a tying-together of problems of cooperation with other issues. There are again hints of some kind of sanctions. I think, I hope very much, that this view-point does not reflect Washington's official position. Otherwise, what would be the point of signing, at the Geneva meeting, even, a special agreement on development of Soviet-U.S. cooperation. We have a good record of fruitful economic cooperation with many countries of Western Europe, for instance with France.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

'FAKED' U.S. REPORT ON ARMS VIOLATIONS CRITICIZED

'Anti-Soviet Song and Dance'

LD221739 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 22 Dec 85

["Washington's Fresh Faked Report"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Dec (TASS)--TASS commentator Aleksandr Sisnev writes:

A fresh anti-Soviet song and dance has been started in the United States around some "violations" by the Soviet Union of its contractual commitments. The sponsors of that campaign are acting according to a well-practiced scenario: On the eve of the publication of the President's official report to the Congress containing charges against the USSR, which is said to be issued on December 23, the U.S. mass media broadly quote that document, whose copies, as the report say, were received by them in advance.

Judging by the "facts", which are cited in the press, it becomes obvious that they in Washington have cooked up a fresh propaganda fraud, whose aim is to discredit the Soviet Union in the eyes of world public and at the same time justify the large-scale military preparations by the USA. It is not fortuitous that the report on, as they put it, violations by the Soviet Union of the treaties in the field of arms control, is appearing at a time when world public expects from Washington a constructive answer to the Soviet Union's proposal on introducing a mutual moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

The report, as the American press itself admits, does not contain any new charges against the USSR. It sets forth the hackneyed inventions unsubstantiated by any concrete facts and which have already more than once been exposed by the Soviet side. Thus, for example, the report is again speculating that the Soviet Union is developing two new types of ICBM's in violation of the SALT-2 treaty. The SS-25 missile is presented for the second "new type". The authors of the report pretend not to know that this is a modernized version of the already existing SS-12 missile, but the question of that missile has already been discussed in detail by the two sides and the Soviet Union presented data testifying that the characteristics of the modernized missile completely accord with the SALT-2 treaty.

The claim that the Soviet Union could have deployed SS-16 missiles, which are prohibited under the SALT-2 treaty, in the area of Plesetskaya proving range, hold no water. The USSR has repeatedly, including in the course of the SALT-2 talks, declared that it did not and does not have missiles among its arms. In claiming the contrary, the USA is apparently simply trying to "gain points" in the propaganda war against the USSR.

The authors of the report are again trying to mislead uninformed people also about the radar station under construction in the area of the city of Krasnoyarsk to which the ABM potentialities are ascribed. The creation of that radar station, the report says, is a violation of the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile defense systems of 1972, which is a deliberate lie.

The Krasnoyarsk radar station is designed solely for the tracking of space objects and outer space control, consequently it has nothing to do with the ABM Treaty.

Openly hypocritical is also the claim made in the report that the USSR may be developing an anti-ballistic missile defense system for the whole of its national territory. Why they needed that lie is quite understandable. In implementing at an accelerated rate the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" which provides for the creation and deployment of a large-scale ABM system with outer space based elements, the United States is doing its utmost in an attempt to present things as if the USSR is creating an ABM system of the national territory.

It is interesting to note that while acusing, without any sound reason or proof, the USSR of "a breach" of its contractual commitments, Washington is trying to pose for a side strictly abiding by its commitments, as if there was no evidence of the violations by the USA of the ABM and Salt-2 treaties, as if Washington did not try to undermine directly strategic stability by deploying new nuclear missiles in Western Europe. As if it were not the USA which is implementing a programme for a militarisation of outer space and leading things to uncontrolled arms race.

Report Features 'Distortion'

LD241332 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, December 24 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Alexander Shalnev:

The White House has forwarded another anti-Soviet fabrication to the Congress, its third report on "Soviet Noncompliance With Arms Control Agreements."

According to President Ronald Reagan, the report "is the product of months of careful technical and legal analysis by all relevant agencies of the United States Government."

Study of the "document," however, hardly leaves any doubts as to the fact that it has been cooked up by professional disinformers. Like the previous two reports, this one features total groundlessness, gross distortion of facts and misinterpretation of key provisions of arms control agreements.

For instance, the report accuses the Soviet Union of an alleged "violation" of the SALT-2 treaty by developing and producing a missile, RS-12M, known in the West as SS-25. The compilers of the fabrication just ignored the fact of which Soviet representatives timely, and in detail, informed the American side, namely: the missile is a modernized version (modernization within certain limits is not banned by the SALT-2 treaty) of the earlier model RS-12.

Just as groundless is the "accusation, contained in the report, that the USSR violates the anti-ballistic missile treaty by building a radar station in the Krasnoyarsk region. On this account, Washington prefers not to notice repeated statements by the Soviet side that the Krasnoyarsk facility is intended exclusively for tracking space objects and monitoring air space and, therefore, has no relation whatsoever to the ABM Treaty.

Other concoctions follow the same pattern. In advancing them; the Washington administration ignores not only obvious facts, but even the opinion of most prominent American experts. According to Spurgeon M. Keeny, former deputy director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the report presents an unbalanced assessment of compliance with arms control accords. Another American expert, General Richard Ellis, former commander of the strategic air force, bluntly declared in the Congress that the Soviet Union has a good record of compliance.

This does not apply to the U.S. compliance record. Contrary to the report claims of the fullest observation of its commitments, Washington, by resorting to slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union, is apparently trying to conceal and justify its violations of arms control accords. The compilers of the report link many anti-Soviet insinuations with the ABM Treaty, the document which the United States is seeking to undermine by establishing a large-scale partially space-based anti-ballistic missile system within its "star wars" programme, thus instigating the arms race.

The President admitted, in fact, that the report on "noncompliance" is a prelude to real, not imaginary, violations on the part of the United States. The President recalled that he had ordered the Pentagon to draw up recommendations as to what reply actions should be undertaken by Washington, specifically with regard to the expansion of the programme of modernizing the U.S. strategic potential. The NBC television network observes in this connection that U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger in his secret memorandum to the President called for abandoning the SALT-2 treaty.

The purpose of the propaganda concoction is to slander the Soviet Union in the eyes of the world public and justify at the same time the U.S. large-scale military preparations. It is no accident that the report on alleged Soviet "violations" of arms control agreements was made at a time when the world public is expecting from Washington a constructive reply to the Soviet Union's proposal on a moratorium on any nuclear blasts. It is noteworthy that the anti-Soviet fabrication was issued only one month after the Soviet-American summit in Geneva which generated a hope worldwide for a constructive dialogue between the USSR and the United States, directed at terminating the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space. Washington, however, prefers to vitiate the atmosphere by its slanderous attacks and ill-concealed threats to carry out fresh violations of treaty commitments.

'Fabrications' on Arms Issues

PM241705 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Gan "Commentator's Column": "A Dirty Game"]

[Text] Washington -- The White House has sent Congress a report on the Soviet Union's so-called "violations" in the arms control sphere. This report, the third, is no more "conclusive" than its two predecessors. It is a gross falsehood and constitutes a collection of Pentagon inventions fabricated with a view to accusing the USSR of "violating" an accord and covering up and justifying their own violations of agreements in the arms control sphere.

The authors of the falsehood are not blessed with imagination, repeating basically the old calumnies about Soviet policy in this sphere which have been repeatedly exposed and refuted in the USSR at the most authoritative level. The U.S. press itself is forced to admit this, as are a number of prominent experts, noting the "disputable nature," to put it mildly, of the assertions contained in the report. This applies both to the Soviet Union's "violation" of the SALT II treaty in connection with its modernization of the RS-12 missile, which the United States calls a "new missile," and to the "violation" of the ABM Treaty through the creation in the Krasnoyarsk region of a radar station designed for space research.

According to recent reports, White House deputy press secretary L. Speakes has announced (at a briefing, as if in passing), that the United States will adhere, at least for the time being, to the provisions of the SALT II Treaty. "However, debates on this question within the administration have by no means finished," NBC television stresses, reporting that "in a secret memorandum to the President, Defense Secretary Weinberger called for the denunciation of this treaty, which the United States has not ratified."

What lies behind the dirty game being played by those who oppose any brakes on the arms race is convincingly exposed today by statements made by politicians in the United States itself. Thus Democratic Senator E. Kennedy's statement met with a great response -- he called on the administration to confirm its adherence to the SALT II provisions, deeming this to be extremely necessary for the attainment by the sides of mutually acceptable accords on curbing the nuclear arms race.

It was clearly no coincidence that the notorious report appeared at precisely the moment when the world public awaits a constructive response from the White House to the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Instead, Washington is maneuvering, avoiding giving a direct answer, and displaying a negative reaction to the Soviet proposal. Here various provocative attacks are used, such as accusing the USSR of violating the SALT II treaty. This approach can only be called irresponsible. It in no way accords with the "spirit of Geneva," but is clearly aimed at complicating Soviet-U.S. relations.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR REPORTS PRESS CONFERENCE ON ARMS RACE

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Coverage

PM191144 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Dec 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "International Security and Questions of Ending the Arms Race; Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists on the subject "World Security and Questions of Ending the Arms Race" was held in Moscow on 18 December.

The following officials took part in the press conference: Vice president of the Academy of Sciences Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, director of the Institute for U.S. and Canada Studies of the Academy of Sciences Academician G.A. Arbatov, director of the Space Research Institute of the Academy of Sciences Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev, deputy head of a directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces Lieutenant General V.P. Starodubov, deputy head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee A.I. Vlasov.

The subject of the press conference, stressed the officials in their statements, meets the spirit of the time, the Soviet-U.S. accords reached during the summit meeting in Geneva which, undoubtedly, introduced positive elements in international life. Statements by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev characterize in detail the Soviet position and the results of the Geneva meeting, express readiness for implementing everything that was reached during the meeting, and voice the hope that the U.S. side will display a similar attitude.

The key issue of the current period is preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on earth. The chief obstacle, the U.S. "star wars" program, remains in the way of its solution. The Soviet Union resolutely criticizes the program not at all because of its fear of SDI as some in the West claim. Attention was drawn in this connection to Mikhail Gorbachev's remarks at his press conference in Geneva that should the "star wars" program be implemented in the United States the Soviet Union will find a response that "will be effective, less costly, and could be carried out within a shorter period." This conclusion is based on the opinion of Soviet scientists and specialists.

For the Soviet Union, the task is to prevent another spiral in the arms race and the development of new types of mass annihilation weapons. The U.S. plans of militarizing outer space will start a new phase in an unpredictable arms race. That is why the

Soviet Union appeals to the reason of political figures and their responsibility for the fate of the world.

On the Soviet concept of security, set forth in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, the Soviet scientists noted that security can only be mutual, while, with regard to the world community as a whole, it can only be universal. One cannot achieve security at the expense of the other side. Genuine statesmanship consists of showing concern not only for your own security, but also for ensuring that the other side does not feel less secure.

Security cannot be built indefinitely on the threat of force instigating the arms race.

Security at the current level of development of means of annihilation and destruction cannot be assured by military-technical means. This is a political task and it can be resolved only by political means. What is needed above all is the political will to stop the arms race -- the chief source of the nuclear war menace -- and start advancing towards disarmament.

Notwithstanding all the differences between the Soviet Union and the United States, one has to learn the art and science of living on one planet, of living together, in a civilized way with due account for each other's interests and in conditions of the development of mutually beneficial cooperation.

An important aspect is the critical nature of the time factor. Political actions should not be postponed until a later date. They are needed immediately. The continuation of the arms race and the emergence of new weapon systems already make dialogue and accords difficult now. Scientific and technological progress in the military field continuously cuts down time and possibilities for making political decisions which involve matters of war and peace.

The Soviet concept of ensuring security also takes into account the fact that the world consists of many dozens of states and peoples, with each of them having vital, quite legitimate interests of their own.

The establishment of a security system under these conditions calls for refraining from global claims and for taking the legitimate interests of all into account.

A new situation has developed in the world. It makes it necessary to become aware of the new realities and to bring political thinking into line with them.

Soviet scientists drew attention to the particularly dangerous and extremely destabilizing nature of the U.S. "star wars" plans which lead to an undermining of strategic stability, strategic chaos, and a new, unlimited round of the arms race.

The participants in the press conference provided data that U.S. supporters of the so-called SDI view outer space as a new theater of military operations with the intention of filling it with various types of weapons as well as using the weapons against missiles, earth-based targets, aircraft, etc. The "star wars" plans undoubtedly undermine the ABM Treaty -- the basis of strategic stability -- and create political and military illusions among certain circles of the West as to a possibility of getting out of the "nuclear stalemate" and conducting and winning nuclear war. This is why SDI is an extremely dangerous and aggressive undertaking.

An analysis carried out by Soviet scientists and by many experts in the West shows that measures to counteract the "star wars" would prove less costly and would be effective enough to neutralize the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

The scientists' conclusions show that even with the most "optimistic" calculations of SDI supporters, the "efficiency of a space shield" would not be more than 80-90 percent. However, even one percent of missiles hitting their targets is enough to deliver a strike which would be equivalent to 5,000 Hiroshimas in terms of the aggregate yield of nuclear burst.

In this connection, Soviet scientists once again called for channeling the huge potential of world science into the accomplishment of tasks of creation, not destruction. The Soviet Union counterposes the "star peace" concept to the "star wars" ones.

The participants in the press conference answered journalists' questions.

Question: How would you describe the U.S. political line on problems of security after the summit meeting in Geneva?

Answer: Not much time has passed after the Geneva meeting. Various opinions of the results and prospects of the summit meeting are expressed in the U.S.

The impression is that the U.S. right-wing circles were frightened by Geneva and are now stepping up pressure aimed at moving not forward, along the way mapped out by the Geneva meeting, but backward. This would be very deplorable and dangerous.

Some representatives of the U.S. mass media play up to this and continue to distort the image of the Soviet Union and its policy.

On the eve of the Geneva meeting THE NEW YORK TIMES held a public opinion poll in the U.S. It turned out that 44 percent of Americans did not know the Soviet Union had been a U.S. ally during World War II. Twenty-eight percent even thought the U.S. had fought against the USSR during World War II.

There exists a deliberate intention to present the Soviet Union with a medieval fanaticism as some sort of "evil force". This follows from such monstrous films as "Rambo II", "Rocky IV" and "Red Dawn". ABC television has prepared the series "America" which features the horrors of a Soviet occupation of the U.S. Forty million dollars have been invested in it.

This is no less dangerous than investing a similar amount in the production of heroin and other drugs.

At present, responsibility is required from everyone if we want a new start in relations between the United States and the USSR.

Question: How do you assess the struggle between the two tendencies in the United States after Geneva regarding questions of Soviet-U.S. relations?

Answer: The moment of truth, which was spoken of in Geneva, of course laid bare the contradictions inside the United States on thesd questions between champions and opponents of the normalization of the international situation and the cessation of the arms race. Geneva has struck a blow against false anti-Soviet propaganda. What is needed now are concrete actions. There is no evading them or talking one's way out of them.

Question: How do you describe the points of contact in the Soviet and U.S. positions on the question of a 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear armaments and on the question regarding medium-range weapons in Europe?

Answer: Understanding of this question should be based on a key provision which the sides considered necessary to confirm at the highest level in the Soviet-U.S. statement. It says that the sides also intend to continue talks in future, with a view to preventing the arms race in space and ending it on earth. As regards the appropriate application of a 50-percent cut in nuclear armaments, we hope that after such a confirmation the talks will be about a cessation of the nuclear arms race, on the condition that an arms race in space is prevented. The fact that these questions are interconnected does not require proof.

Bearing this in mind, we hope that when the USSR and U.S. delegations meet at the talks in January, the U.S. side will agree to really radical cuts in all kinds of nuclear arms which make up the strategic balance of the sides and will not be looking for advantages, giving preference to some individual kinds of such armaments.

As to the point of contact in the question on medium-range weapons in Europe, here, too, we hope it will lead us to a real accord. The recognition of the fact that medium-range missiles being deployed by the United States -- Pershing-2 and cruise missiles -- are part of the strategic balance and that the question of these missiles needs solving is the key question here.

That is precisely how we regard the points of contact mentioned. As has been said repeatedly, the Soviet side is ready to tackle these questions on the basis of the principles of equality and equal security.

Question: It has been said here that the possible Soviet countermeasures against SDI will effectively neutralize it. Why, in that case, is the Soviet side opposing that program so strongly?

Answer: We are not afraid of the threat that SDI will create. What we are afraid of is what the United States, and Europe, and all the rest ought to fear: a situation of total strategic chaos and an unlimited arms race. All that could bring nuclear war closer. That is what everyone should be afraid of -- both the Americans and their allies, who, under the pretext of Atlantic solidarity, are trying to shake off responsibility for vitally important political decisions concerning the fate of peace and of their own peoples.

Question: Will the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions be extended in 1986?

Answer: The Soviet moratorium has been declared until 1 January 1986. And although the new year is not far off, there is still time for a decision to be made on this question. The Soviet Union awaits a concrete and positive response from the U.S. leadership. Such a response would have a very favorable effect on the whole world situation. As the Soviet leadership has already declared, the USSR is ready to prolong the moratorium if there is reciprocity on the part of the United States.

Question: The latest statements by Secretary of State Shultz are seen in the Soviet Union as a departure from the "spirit of Geneva." What can you say about this?

Answer: That question is already being covered in detail in the Soviet press. Attempts to cast doubt on the Yalta agreements and the main accords of Helsinki do, of course, represent a step backwards and we are bound to say so.

That does not, however, reduce our determination to fight for the implementation of the accords reached at the Geneva summit and for the successful development of the process that was begun there. This applies to all countries; here there are no detached observers. This is a cause in which the United States, the Soviet Union, and the other states of the world all have an interest. We are entitled to expect that they will all adopt an active position on the most important questions of our time.

Those taking part in the press conference also answered other questions from journalists.

Arbatov, Velikhov Remarks

LD182219 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Remarks by Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of the United States and Canada of the Academy of Sciences, and by Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the Academy of Sciences, at the news conference held on 18 December at the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow on the topic of international security and the arms race; recorded, apart from announcer's remarks]

[Excerpt] [Arbatov] At Geneva there came into contact or, to put it frankly, into collision not only different positions on the limiting of various weapons or on regional conflicts, but also two different, I would say even mutually opposed, concepts of security.

Well, I shall speak in more detail about the Soviet concept of security, which was recently expressed in an entire series of our official documents; first and foremost, in the latest speeches of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Paris, Geneva, and Moscow. First of all, if we are speaking of the USSR and the United States, security can only be reciprocal. If we are speaking of the world community as a whole, then it can only be universal. We cannot achieve security to the detriment of or against the other side, but only together with it. Moreover, today, true state wisdom -- and Comrade Gorbachev spoke of this in Geneva -- is not only to be concerned for one's own security, but also to be concerned that the other side feels no less secure than you do.

The second component is that security cannot go on endlessly, being built on fear in the face of unacceptable retaliation or, as they still say, on the balance of fear or, to express it in military language, on restraint or deterrence, because apart from very weighty moral reasons, these conditions only spur on the arms race. In order to frighten the other side, you must continue arming all the time. This arms race is getting our of control and is going far beyond the bounds of everything reasonable that is required for such a mutually unacceptable retaliatory threat.

The third component is that at the present level of the development of means of destruction and annihilation, security cannot be ensured by military technical means. It is a political task and it can be solved only by political means. First of all, what is needed is political will in order to end the arms race, which has become the main source of threat of nuclear war, and to start moving back to disarmament.

But there is also a more basic and more long-term task and this is -- even with all the differences which exist between us and the United States, even with all the differences which exist in general among countries -- to learn the art and science of getting along together on the same planet, living together and in a civilized manner without rhetorical excesses, taking account of each other's interests and in conditions of the development of mutually advantageous cooperation.

Another important factor is the critical nature of the time factor. These political actions must not be postponed until the distant future. They are needed now, immediately. If it were possible, they were even needed yesterday.

Yet another important component of the Soviet concept of security is that it is necessary to see that the USSR and the United States comprise only 10 percent of the population of the world; that the world does not boil down to just them, even with all the responsibility, the political role, and the influence of these powers. It is important to see that the world is complicated, interconnected, and interdependent. It is a world of many tens of states and peoples, each of which has its vital and quite legitimate interests. It is a world which is not and cannot be an object of the policy of the great powers. It is a world in which all the countries are independent subjects in international relations. And at the same time, it is a world which is in the process of change; no one can guarantee an external status quo.

Consequently, in these complicated objective conditions it is necessary to create a new security system by refraining from globalist pretentions and taking account of the legitimate interests of other powers and bringing all of these interests of the various states into some sort of harmony. We are trying to bring our political thinking and our political activity into accord with these new realities, not claiming that we have already totally resolved these tasks for ourselves or that we can solve these tasks by ourselves. On the contrary, we are inviting all the other powers to participate in this great work. Such, then, in short, is the concept of security which has been taking shape in the actions and statements of the Soviet leadership recently.

To me as a political researcher, it seems an important and perhaps the only possible platform for the joint actions of states, if we wish to ensure the survival of mankind. I must say with regret that at Geneva we came up against a different concept of security from the U.S. side: the concept of trying to ensure security with the aid of weapons and military-technical means, with the aim of some sort of technical conjuring trick which might finally, allegedly, provide that age-old dream and give mankind eternal peace.

The key element here is "star wars." I cannot twist my language round to call this the Strategic Defense Initiative, because it has nothing to do with defense.

[Announcer] Academicians Velikhov and Sagdeyev, who spoke afterwards, dwelt on a number of aspects of the U.S. "star wars" doctrine, displaying its complete insolvency as a means of ridding mankind from the nuclear threat. In describing the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, Academician Velikhov said in part:

[Velikhov] It must be said that the new U.S. space troops command does not conceal its tasks of turning space into a new zone or theater of military actions and filling it with various types of weapons from space to geosynchronous orbits. [sentence as heard] This is a great danger which now faces the whole world. It is a fundamental danger and it is first and foremost, the task of everyone to prevent this danger. Therefore, in conclusion, I would say that what is important now is a general understanding of the whole problem, an understanding by every person on our planet, an understanding by all peoples. We are at just such a critical moment now with space weapons as we were 40 years ago, when the question was raised of whether or not there would be nuclear weapons. But today we have considerably more technical opportunities for saying that space weapons should not come into being.

Velikhov Interviewed

LD191125 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Text] At a press conference on Wednesday [18 December] morning a group of top Soviet experts addressed the topic of Geneva and the future. Later Vladimir Posner interviewed the vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Yevgeniy Velikhov, who was one of the Soviet experts at Geneva and, of course, one of the press conference's most visible and sought after participants. And now, Vladimir Posner:

Before getting down to the interview with Yevgeniy Velikhov, I would like to make two points. One, that the tone set by the academicians -- Arbatov, Sagdeyev, and Velikhov, as well as by Lieutenant General Starodubov -- was definitely constructive, indicating the Soviet desire for a follow-up and tangible progress after Geneva. The other, the SDI -- more commonly and actually probably more correctly called "star wars" -- looms on the horizon as the single most destructive and negative element, capable of wrecking any progress, as well as existing agreements. Now the interview, which I conducted in Russian and which I will translate for you:

[Question] What, in your opinion, are the main areas of agreement, the most important results of Geneva?

[Answer] First of all, the important thing is that both sides agreed and declared they believe nuclear war to be unthinkable, that it must be thwarted, that neither side seeks superiority -- military superiority -- over the other and will continue to negotiate with the aim of stopping the arms race on the earth and preventing it from happening in space.

The latter aspect, as formulated and supported at the top level of government, is extremely important because only in this conjunction, by combining both aims, can there be achieved any radical arms reduction while at the same time blocking the development of any kind of new, global space weapons.

[Question] If scientists -- and you affirmed this -- if both American and Soviet scientists have found that the SDI shield is not impregnable, that it has holes, cannot give 100 percent cover, then why are we so adamantly against it?

[Answer] The answer to that may be found in President Reagan's initial statement on SDI. He then said, speaking of his vision of a foolproof shield, that if such work is combined with efforts aimed at preserving the present level of offensive weapons or increasing that level, then the other side must see this as aggression. I'm not quoting him verbatim, but that is what he said and that is exactly the case. An imperfect shield makes sense only in conjunction or coexistence with strategic offensive weapons and in that case, it represents a far greater threat to the country that will have to retaliate or answer a first strike then it does to the launcher of a first-strike attack. And that is why SDI must be seen as an element of aggression.

[Question] Some say that since countermeasures, as you pointed out during the press conference, are far cheaper -- a hundred times actually -- than SDI, why worry? Let the Americans spend themselves to death while we perfect our countermeasures without it being too much of an economic burden. How do you feel about such views?

[Answer] To begin with, as I noted before, that approach concerns only part of the issue. It solves the question of preserving the strategic balance of forces. But the real question is: What will that strategic equilibirum be like? If it is one with more strategic warheads, less stability, leading to crises and tensions, then it is one we definitely do not desire. We say we do not fear SDI in the economic sense. It will not make us go bankrupt. But it will be very dangerous for the world, which is why we warn it should be avoided. After all, we have concrete historical experience to look back on.

When the issue of strategic defense first came up it led to the development of so-called MIRV's, that is multiple, individually targetable reentry vehicles. After that we concluded the ABM Treaty of 1972, but it hardly affected the MIRV's. The result was a six- to seven-fold increase in warheads in the American strategic arsenal as well as a significant increase in that of the Soviet Union. The United States believed we would not be able to MIRV [as heard] for many years, the kind of mistake they have committed time and time again. That mistake led to a huge and completely unnecessary growth of the nuclear arsenal. Today we speak of a 50 percent cut in warheads, but if we all had not MIRVed back then we would have seven times fewer warheads today than we have -- that's 700 percent, not 50. So, we're calling upon the Americans not to repeat the same kind of mistake.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S GEN LEBEDEV EVALUATES STRATEGIC PARITY

PM191409 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 85 p 2

[Major General Yu. Lebedev article under the rubric "Authoritative Opinion," written in response to reader's letter: "Parity" -- First three paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] The draft new edition of the CPSU Program stresses that the establishment of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO was socialism's historic achievement.

Please tell us in more detail what is behind this conclusion.

D. Lukonskiy, Amur Oblast.

Military-strategic parity consolidated the positions of the USSR, the socialist countries, and all progressive forces, frustrating the aggressive imperialist circles' hopes of winning a global nuclear war.

The Soviet Union does not strive for military superiority and believes that approximate equilibrium is enough for its defense needs. The parity undoubtedly hinges upon approximate equality in the quantity and quality of USSR and U.S. strategic armaments and also of Warsaw Pact and NATO medium-range nuclear facilities and conventional armaments.

Military-strategic parity did not occur overnight. In the early sixties the U.S. nuclear potential exceeded the level of the Soviet Union's nuclear arms. The so-called strategic triad was created consisting of ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers. The United States was the first in the world to arm its ballistic missiles with MIRVed warheads and begin creating a new type of strategic weapon: long-range air-, sea-, or land-based cruise missiles.

During the seventies 550 new Minuteman-3 ICBM's with 3 warheads each were deployed, the Trident-1 SLBM was created, and 31 submarines were equipped with Poseidon missiles (each of which has 10-14 warheads). Strategic bombers were armed with short-range attack missiles (up to 20 missiles per aircraft). As a result, the U.S. strategic potential in terms of nuclear charges and approximately doubled by the beginning of this decade, rising from 5,100 to 10,000 units. The Pentagon actually increased its arsenal by three nuclear charges a day.

Together with the buildup of the U.S. strategic potential the NATO bloc also increased its European nuclear arsenal. In addition to the hundreds of U.S. missile-carrying aircraft in Western Europe, NATO has also been given U.S. missile-carrying submarines armed with Polaris SLBM's -- 400 warheads in all. Aircraft carriers with missile-carrying aircraft on board appeared in the seas and oceans around Europe. Certain other NATO countries began deploying their nuclear missile facilities in Europe.

In 1979 NATO made the decision to deploy qualitatively new medium-range nuclear missile facilities -- ground-based Pershing-2 ICBM's and cruise missiles -- in Western Europe.

By advancing its nuclear armaments toward the USSR's borders the United States, circumventing the SALT-II treaty, had essentially acquired for itself an additional strategic potential.

The USSR was forced to respond to the growing military threat by strengthening its own defense capability. The primary attention here was paid to strategic forces as the main element of a retaliatory strike. The measures taken by the CPSU and the Soviet Government at the beginning of the seventies enabled them to nullify the U.S. superiority in the strategic arms sphere. In February 197 the U.S. President stated: "Today neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has a clear nuclear advantage. "Washington officially acknowledged the balance of strategic nuclear forces that had been created between the USSR and the United States. This balance was repeatedly verified during the process of elaborating the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty and officially enshrined by the two countries' leaders when the treaty was signed in 1979.

The number of strategic delivery vehicles possessed by the sides at present is virtually unchanged in comparison with 1979. The USSR has 2,504 units, the United States 2,215 units. Although the USSR has somewhat more vehicles, the United States still has the advantage by virtue of its heavy bombers armed with long-range cruise missiles and bombs. But overall, approximate equilibrium has been established. This cannot be denied in the United States. The Joint Chiefs of Staff noted in a report to Congress (1984): "At present there is approximate nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union."

However, the nuclear equilibrium between the USSR and NATO is formed not just from Soviet and U.S. strategic armaments. The U.S. (forward-based) medium-range nuclear facilities create a direct threat to the territory of the USSR and its allies. Furthermore, in Europe there are corresponding British and French nuclear armaments. To balance out NATO's nuclear forces in Europe the Soviet Union, in addition to its missile-carrying aircraft, first deployed SS-4 and SS-5 medium-range missiles in the European zone of the USSR and then replaced them with more modern SS-20 missiles of the same class. In modernizing its medium-range nuclear facilities in the European zone of the country and deploying one new missile for every one-two old missiles, the USSR has not upset the correlation of forces in this region in its favor.

The United States currently has 218 missiles deployed in Western Europe and, with the British and French missiles included, NATO has 396 medium-range missiles here. The USSR has 243 SS-20 missiles in the European zone. The number of SS-20 warheads is no more than on NATO's missiles. Including its air forces in Europe, NATO has a certain advantage in terms of delivery vehicles. The correlation of nuclear charges, approximately 3,000 to 2,000, is also in NATO's favor. However, if you take into account the differences in the composition of the sides' nuclear armaments there are still grounds for talking about approximate equilibrium in this category of nuclear facilities, too.

The picture is similar with conventional arms. The NATO countries exceed the Warsaw Pact in terms of the total number of the sides' armed forces personnel, in the number of combat-ready divisions, and antitank facilities and are approximately equal in artillery and armored hardware numbers. The Warsaw Pact countries' armed forces have somewhat more tactical aircraft than the NATO countries. Overall, an approximate balance of forces has been created in conventional arms, also. Thus, the military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is an objective fact.

However, the United States does not stop trying to upset the balance of forces in its favor. The Pentagon is stepping up the creation [sozdaniye] of a new generation of highly accurate "disabling" first-strike nuclear arms systems,capable of hitting well-defended, small targets.

Such systems include MX and Midgetman ICBM's, Trident-2 SLBM's, cruise missiles with a range of more than 4,000 km, and B1-B and Stealth strategic bombers. The deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe is continuing. Conventional weapons, approximating nuclear weapons in terms of their destructive power, are also being improved.

Nevertheless, none of these systems will strengthen U.S. security since the USSR has responded and will continue responding to its actions in equal measure. Now the United States has chosen outer space as the sphere of confrontation. Having begun work within the "star wars" program, it has set about developing a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. The aim is to create [sozdat] a space "shield," enabling the United States to deliver a nuclear first strike against the Soviet Union with impunity and deprive it of the possibility of a retaliatory strike.

But these schemes are illusory. Addressing the press conference in Geneva, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed: "The Soviet leadership has already given the relevant instructions to competent organizations and scientists and we can say that our response will be effective, less costly,and may be realized in a shorter period."

The Soviet Union opposes this development of the situation. It urges that the military-strategic parity thus formed be the starting point for nuclear arms reduction. During the Geneva summit the U.S. side was told that if the arms race in space is prevented our proposals and the U.S. proposals make it possible to achieve progress, seek compromises, and achieve parity at a lower level. An accord can be reached if it considers both sides' security interests. That is the aim of our proposal on a 50-percent reduction in the USSR and U.S. nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory. It goes without saying, of course, that in this context strike armaments must not be deployed in space. Strategic parity rules out the possibility of unilateral advantages and guarantees peace and international security.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

TASS: 'ANGRY' LORD CARRINGTON CRITICIZES NATO ALLIES

LD200710 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 19 TASS -- TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Lord Carrington is angry. Speaking to officers and generals of NATO countries in Karlsruhe, the NATO general secretary, obviously reflecting the Pentagon's sentiments, strongly criticized the two NATO allies -- Greece and Denmark.

Why was the NATO general secretary so angry? Greece and Denmark, you see, dared to take their own special stance on questions of nuclear politics, which strongly differs from that of the United States and other NATO member-countries.

He was angry with Greece and Denmark, since they come out against deployment of American medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. At the December NATO marathon session, despite a strong pressure, they did not back Washington's demand of continued deployment in Western Europe of American Cruise and Pershing-2 missiles -- the first strike nuclear weapons.

In the American style, ignoring the right of sovereign states to conduct their own political course, Lord Carrington assailed the Danish Folketing (Parliament), which in its resolution make it incumbent upon the government to "support all efforts with a view of avoiding any deployment of new or modernised nuclear weapons both in Eastern and Western Europe, including tactical nuclear weapons, nuclear artillery shells, atomic aerial bombs and neutron weapons" , and to bar nuclear weapons from Denmark's territory both in peace or war time.

In the opinion of the NATO general secretary, that is a signal of danger. He discerns a threat to the United States and the whole of the NATO block in such a stance of the Danish legislative body which reflects the sentiments of the people.

The NATO leader was perhaps even more upset by the stance of Greece which dared to join Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden, who addressed a joint message to the leaders of the USSR and USA call [as received] upon them that they should take efficient steps to considerably reduce the arsenals of nuclear weapons and to prevent the arms race in outer space.

Lord Carrington did not leave without his critical attention also anti-nuclear views of the oppositional social-democratic and socialist parties of NATO countries, including Britain and FRG which together with the broad public declared for preventing the arms race from spreading to outer space. In his opinion, this weakens Western positions.

Lord Carrington recalled in Karlsruhe many other "sins" of NATO allies, criticizing some of them for insufficient zeal in stepping up the arms race, in building up tension between East and West, calling upon them for unity, "Atlantic solidarity", that is for full support of the Pentagon's military doctrines.

The impression is that the NATO leader "has forgotten" about the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva which undoubtedly introduced positive elements into international life, laid the prerequisites for improving the international situation. He pronouncements by no means accord with the "Geneva spirit".

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON NATO FOREIGN MINISTERS' SESSION

'Allegiance to Former Militaristic Course'

LD161617 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 14 Dec 85

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The NATO Council has just held a session in Brussels at the level of foreign ministers. The NATO Council, writes our commentator Yuriy Solton, has gathered for the first time since the Soviet-American summit in Geneva, and so the foreign ministers, giving public opinion its due, could not but speak positively about the summit's results. A provision was mentioned for one, as contained in the joint Soviet-American statement, that the Soviet and American leaders favor speeding up progress on the drafting of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. But the practical deeds of NATO run counter exactly to this understanding.

As it has declared officially, the Soviet Union deems it possible to conclude an appropriate agreement separately without a direct link to the problem of space and strategic arms. In this case, naturally, it is impossible to discount Britain and France, whose nuclear potentials kept growing within the European balance of forces. The Soviet Union suggests a direct exchange of views in this case. On its own initiative it has removed from standby alert the SS-20 missiles deployed in the European zone additionally. The stationary facilities for these missiles have been fully dismantled, as it was promised. What is the NATO countries' response?

They have taken a decision to go ahead even faster than expected with the deployment in Western Europe of American Pershing II and cruise missiles which are both first-strike nuclear weapons. It has been reported from Brussels that by the end of the year roughly one half of the 572 such missiles intended for Western Europe will have been sited there and placed on standby alert. That mounts to a policy of wrecking the useful results gained in Geneva.

As observers note, much time was devoted in Brussels to discussing the "star wars" theme. The U.S. secretary of state, George Shultz, urged his NATO partners not simply to support this military space United States program [as heard] but to become directly involved in its realization. As a consequence of strike space weapons appearing, there can be only an intensification of the arms race along all directions and a sharp drop in the security of all nations including the United States and its allies. Nevertheless, before the NATO Council session the British and American defense secretaries signed a memorandum on drawing Britain into the "star wars" program. The corresponding accord is being hastened with the United States by the government of the FRG. But far from all the NATO countries toed the American line in this regard. France, Denmark, Norway, Greece, the Netherlands, and Canada refused to take part in the "star wars" program. Statements were also made in Brussels to stress the need to observe such important arms limitation agreements as the SALT II treaty and the 1972 ABM treaty.

The situation in Europe and worldwide is quite different now from what it was only a few months ago. People have hope again that it will be possible to bring about a turn for the better in international affairs. Such sentiments have their influence in the NATO countries too. However, on the whole, the NATO Council session has displayed allegiance to the former militaristic course aimed at a buildup of the NATO military, both nuclear and conventional, potential, and breaking down the rough balance of forces in Eruope.

U.S. 'Resorted to Blackmail'

LD162309 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 16 Dec 85

[Sergey Lebedev commentary]

[Text] In the commentary that follows, Radio Moscow's Sergey Lebedev discusses the results of two NATO sessions in Brussels, a session of defense ministers and a session of foreign ministers. This is what he writes.

Both get togethers in Brussels revealed a rift in how the key issues of NATO's strategy are viewed in the United States and in the West European nations. Since the Europeans hold a guarded attitude towards the "star wars" program, the American delegation did not risk placing this issue on the agenda for a large-scale discussion by the allies. Only London and Bonn could have supported the American efforts to push through the idea of building attack space weapons.

This very fact shows that the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative is becoming a stumbling block which the magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT believes quite soon will determine relations between the NATO countries.

If Weinberger's visit to Europe produced a deal on the "star wars" project with London, it had become clear by the time Shultz arrived on the continent that London's haste and the critical remarks that the decision of the Thatcher cabinet had drawn even from the major papers in Wall Street had rather served as scare away advertisement for Western Europe.

Differences in the alliance manifested themselves just as clearly in the approach to other major aspects of NATO policy. It is obvious, for one, that Western Europe would like to see concrete action on the Geneva summit. Statements made by practically everyone, including Geoffrey Howe, boil down to this: Washington should continue to promote the Geneva spirit and sign concrete agreements with Moscow to curb the arms race. Secretary of State Shultz, however, tried to sidestep any commitment that would meet the wishes of the allies halfway. He gave them to understand it was not at all obligatory to back up the Geneva results with any productive talks, and he practically turned a deaf ear when the allies urged him to abide by the ABM and SALT II treaties with the Soviet Union.

When Mikhail Gorbachev said in Moscow that the Soviet Union had dismantled all the SS-20s that had been deployed following the deployment of American cruise and Pershing missiles in Western Europe, a contrary statement was made almost on the same day in Brussels. It was announced that a considerable number of American medium-range nuclear missiles would be deployed in Western Europe by the end of the year. The further course of the foreign ministers' conference in Brussels showed that the United States was still refusing to view the French and British nuclear forces as a growing might of two nuclear powers that notably affect security in Europe.

Along with the escalation of American nuclear weapons, Washington imposed on the allies the planned production of up-to-date weapons in Europe. At both sessions in Brussels, the American delegations resorted to blackmail. The American General Rogers, commander of NATO forces in Europe, said again that if the West Europeans did not begin to develop systems of costly arms he would have to issue an order to use nuclear weapons within a matter of days in the event of a conflict. Weinberger on his part made it clear that American soldiers would leave Europe if the Europeans did not make super efforts to develop advanced weapons. This open pressure was exerted on the pretext of a new strategy to coordinate arms production in the framework of NATO.

But the camouflage was dispelled by no other than Secretary of State Shultz. He told the allies that his country's huge military spending was angering American congressmen and that they must adopt laws on balanced budget spending to develop new arms, including the "star wars" program. [sentence as heard]

So we can see that the scare away tactics of Rogers and Weinberger can be easily explained. The American Administration has been facing political and economic difficulties as it acts on a program for total rearmament. The setbacks of such a policy should be made up for by the allies' extra efforts and heavier spending. To sum up the two NATO sessions in Brussels, we would only like to add that after the Soviet-American summit at Geneva the United States and other NATO countries do not intend to give up their stake o. armed strength. [sentence as heard]

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SHEVARDNADZE SPEECH AT LUNCHEON FOR ROMANIAN FOREIGN MINISTER

LD242153 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1920 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Excerpts]

Moscow, 24 Dec (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs, today gave a luncheon in honor of Ilie Vaduva, member of the RCP Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the Socialist Republic of Romania. Present at the luncheon on the Soviet side were M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yu.P. Batalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; S.V. Chervonenko, head of department of the CPSU Central Committee; USSR ministers; chairmen of USSR state committees; and other officials.

Addressing the guest, E.A. Shevardnadze said: We have had a useful exchange of views and were able once again to be convinced that relations between our countries are developing fruitfully in all areas. The accords in principle and the understanding reached at the personal meetings and in contacts between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and N. Ceausescu, secretary general of the RCP, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, are determinant for them. These relations are based on the firm foundation of the treaty on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance, which reliably serves the interests of both countries. Their development is a notable contribution to the collective cause of the fraternal socialist countries.

The talks which have taken place confirm that at the present stage we see our main task in preserving and strengthening peace, deflecting the nuclear threat, halting the arms race and not allowing its being spread to new spheres. The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and President R. Reagan, which took place in Geneva, has created favorable preconditions for the lowering of international tension and the drawing up of practical accords on a radical reduction of nuclear arsenals in combination with a ban on the creation of space strike weapons.

It is important that an accord in principle on the object and aims of the talks between the USSR and the United States on nuclear and space armaments was clearly confirmed in Geneva.

The Soviet Union truly conforms to the spirit of Geneva, taking steps, including unilateral ones, intended to further advance that which was begun at the meeting of the highest leaders of the USSR and United States. As is known, the Soviet side has as a demonstration of good will withdrawn from alert duty the SS-20 missiles additionally deployed earlier in the European zone. The fixed installations for these missiles have been dismantled. This was all done after the meeting in Geneva.

The moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union on any nuclear explosions has been valid since 6 August this year. We are calling upon the United States to cease carrying out such explosions. Were they to follow our example, a bilateral moratorium would be established, which would be the first major step on the road of stopping the nuclear arms race.

The Soviet side has expressed its readiness, in the aim of raising the effectiveness of verification, to make use of the famous proposal by the six states to set up on their territories special stations monitoring the fulfillment of the accord on the termination of tests. Moreover, we have informed the U.S. Government of the fact that we are ready to go even further -- to reach an agreement in the event of the establishment of a mutual moratorium -- on some measures of verification in situ, in order to be fully sure that such a moratorium is being observed. We also did this after Geneva.

I would also like to remind you of the fact that for some years now the USSR has not been carrying out any antisatellite weapons tests, notwithstanding the fact that the U.S. side is continuing these tests. Here also we are acting in the spirit of Geneva and showing restraint in the hope that the U.S. side will after all prefer to stop in this dangerous direction of the arms race. In other words, in our practical deeds, we are embodying the spirit of Geneva, the understanding achieved there.

Against this background, the line being followed by the U.S. side cannot fail to put one on one's guard. Let us put it bluntly: A whole series of statements and actions by Washington of late do not correspond to the accords in Geneva.

What is plainly felt in all of this is the mood of those U.S. forces which have always counted on confrontation, on whipping up the arms race, on increasing tension, and who would like to hold back, or better, break off the process begun in Geneva. Unfortunately, this destructive approach also manifests itself, in the positions from which spokesmen of the U.S. Administration speak. For it is a fact that Washington has not reacted positively, has not responded, to a single manifestation of our good will, nor to a single constructive signal from us. They have not taken a single practical step there in the field of security which would correspond to the meaning of the Geneva accords and contribute to their development.

Do actions to step up the implementation of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" really accord with it? Are its steps to establish understandings with its allies to realize the "star wars" project really in this direction? In essence, some West European countries which are getting involved in this project are acting in a way which is directly contrary to the Geneva mutual understanding. Britain has become a direct accomplice in extending the arms race to space, undermining the treaty on limiting systems of antimissile defense. The FRG Government is also close to this. A wide gap between statements in support of the results of Geneva and actions which undermine these results is characteristic of the conduct of the governments of these countries. The peoples are waiting not for dutiful peaceloving words, but actions which are useful for peace [mir] and international security.

We cannot but also pay attention to the fact that high-ranking representatives of the U.S. Administration, including the U.S. secretary of state, have recently started to speak in a language which is different from the language of the Geneva meeting. What does this mean? Is it accidental? Or is it something greater? For politicians must think of the consequences of their utterances, see the boundary beyond which rhetoric destroys trust and creates obstacles for conducting a constructive dialogue. And when the political-territorial realities in Europe are being called into doubt, this is already playing with fire.

Also completely irresponsible are lofty phrases about the role of strength, claims that allegedly precisely the build-up of U.S. strength has made talks with the Soviet Union possible. First, such claims contain not a grain of truth. Second, they are extremely harmful, for they not only justify the arms race but can also create additional complications along the road of the realization of the accord on holding future Soviet-U.S. meetings.

Such statements and such behavior are not merely in disharmony with, but on the contrary, they run counter to a resolution of the problem of improving Soviet-U.S. relations of normalizing the Geneva international situation, that is, against the essence of what above all was agreed upon at the Geneva meeting.

Today as never before, responsible policy consists of making a sober assessment of the realities of the modern world, appreciating where a course toward stepping up tension and encouraging an uncontrolled arms race can lead, and drawing practical conclusions from this. Unfortunately, many Western politicians lack their sense of responsibility.

In today's complex and sometimes dangerous conditions, it is the task of all progressive, peace-loving forces to redouble their efforts, and not permit a new slide toward confrontation, or further aggravation of the international situation. It is especially important that all the socialist countries work concertedly and speak from unified positions.

I. Vaduva made a speech in reply.

He said: Lasting relations of friendship and fruitful comprehensive mutually beneficial cooperation have come about between our peoples, countries, and parties in the interests of the cause of socialism and communism, peace and cooperation in Europe and throughout the world. I should like to note the enormous significance of meetings between the leaders of our parties and states, of the conversations between N. Ceausescu, secretary general of the RCP and president of the SRR, and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

We see in this a new and mighty contribution with which the USSR is making toward affirming of the prestige of socialism in the world, to the cause of peace and social progress. The Romanian people, like all peoples of the world, followed the summit meeting in Geneva with keen attention. The actual holding of the meeting and the adoption of the joint statement are particularly important facts. However, the arms race is not ceasing and actions aimed at militarizing space are continuing. Our party and state consider that it is essential to do everything to move on from statements to specific understanding and to effective disarmament measures.

In the spirit of the decisions of the 13th RCP Congress, the party and state will cooperate consistently on the international arena with the USSR, with the socialist countries which are members of the Warsaw Pact and with all the socialist states in order to ensure disarmament, peace, and the triumph of reason.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1209

USSR: U.S. INTENTIONS FOR SALT II TREATY REMAIN IN DOUBT

Official Renunciation Demanded

LD242004 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 24 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes: Ultra-rightist quarters in the United States of late have mounted a blitz to discredit the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT-2), demanding that the United States either officially renounce it after December 31, 1985, or finally undercut it de facto with further violations of its more important provisions.

As is known, the ratification of SALT-2, which was signed in 1979, has been frustrated by the United States. The present U.S. Administration, which took over in 1981, called it "fatally flawed" and let it be known that it does not consider itself bound by its provisions. The new administration's harshly negative attitude to SALT is explained primarily by the fact that the 1979 treaty has established certain barriers to building up and upgrading the more powerful strategic arms and thus become an impediment to the plans of achieving military superiority, which were finalized by the U.S. Republican Party at its 1980 convention.

Not daring to contradict world public opinion openly, however, the White House later, in May 1982, declared its intention not to take any action that would hamstring the treaty.

As the U.S. leaders saw it, SALT-2 should acquire the nature of a semi-official understanding which would, on the one hand, allow Washington to keep itself free of any firm commitments to limit its own strategic arms and, on the other, provide the U.S. with a possibility to use this document for foreign policy and propaganda maneuvering on the international scene.

U.S. Under Secretary of Defense Fred Ikle once admitted bluntly that the United States was going to abide by international arms control treaties for only as long as they did not interfere with U.S. military programs. In other words, Washington intended to proceed in its practical actions from the assumption that SALT-2 only limited the activities of the other side, while having no practical or legal significance to the United States itself.

It is guided by this double standard that Washington has, among other things, publicly announced its intention to sell Britain Trident-2 missiles that are subject to limitation under SALT-2. Article 12 of that treaty bound the parties not to circumvent its provisions through any other state or states or by any other means. Its meaning is that the parties should not seek unilateral military advantages through their allies, by passing strategic systems on to them, instead of limiting or scrapping them as demanded by the treaty.

Without a twinge of conscience,the United States has ignored also the SALT-2 provision prohibiting each side to develop more than one intercontinental ballistic missile.

The U.S. currently completes testing a new kind of ICBM, the MX missile, while simultaneously working on a second ICBM, the Midgetman, which is a glaring breach of the treaty. The United States has also violated the SALT-2 ban on deliberate camouflage techniques complicating verification and other of the treaty's provisions all the time.

In a bid to draw public attention away from the U.S. violations of obligations assumed under the treaty, which is a diversionary tactic the American propaganda machinery has mastered perfectly well, U.S. Administration officials now make futile attempts to put the blame for the Pentagon's sins on the Soviet Union, without being squeamish about using the silliest inventions.

The Soviet Union does not seek military superiority. It has proved this both with its unilateral practical steps in the military field and with its peace initiatives on the diplomatic scene. The USSR does not have any stimuli to break accords that are based on the principle of equality and equal security, let alone renounce them. Its positive attitude to SALT-2 has never changed.

It is to be hoped that in the United States, too, they will arrive at the conclusion that it is in the interests of their own security to observe international accords.

Possible Review of U.S. Decision

LD241209 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 24 Dec 85

["SALT-II Agreement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, 24 Dec (TASS) -- The White House has announced that the United States intends to continue to adhere to the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty. "However, debate on this issue in the Reagan administration is far from finished," stressed the NBC television company, reporting that "Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, in a secret memorandum addressed to the President, called for this treaty, which has not been ratified by the United States, to be rejected." According to the NBC television company's evidence, other "hard-line supporters in the administration" are also demanding that the United States should cease to observe this and a number of other agreements in the arms control field.

Attention is drawn to the fact that L. Speakes, the deputy press secretary at the White House, announced the decision to observe SALT II almost in passing, whilst replying to questions at a briefing held in connection with the publication of another anti-Soviet falsehood, a report on supposed violations by the Soviet Union of agreements in the arms control field. Moreover, Speakes indicated that the decision taken by the White House is not final in character and might soon be reviewed. "We will not violate the treaty until we have made a statement to the contrary," said L. Speakes, noting that the present decision might be reviewed "at the end of next spring, when a new submarine will be put into operation."

"The Pentagon is recommending that the new submarine be launched in the spring of next year without scrapping old submarines as is required by the SALT II treaty, NBC notes. "The President promised to observe SALT II. If we make a decision that the administration must change its attitude to the treaty, then we will inform the Soviet Union," the official White House spokesman stated.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1206

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS VIEWS ROMANIAN, BULGARIAN BALKANS APPEAL FOR NFZ

LD251914 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 25 Dec 85

["Step in the Only Correct Direction"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 25 TASS -- TASS commentator Yevgeniy Verlin writes:

The last days of the outgoing year have brought for the Europeans one more major political initiative aimed at ensuring a safer future. Two Balkan countries, Romania and Bulgaria, have called upon their neighbours to make the Balkan peninsula a zone free from chemical weapons. The call was made by Todor Zhivkov and Nicolae Ceausescu in pursuance of the package of proposals of the socialist countries which were made from rostrums of different international forums, also in the recent statement of the Sofia meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states. The allied socialist countries consistently stand both for global solutions of problems of the arms race and international security, and solution of these issues regionally.

In autumn this year the GDR and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic called upon the FRG to enter into negotiations on establishing on the territory of these three countries a zone free from chemical weapons. That call, which had a broad response, was supported by other socialist states, prominent politicians and the public of West European countries. As to the USSR, it has repeatedly declared that it is ready to make its utmost towards establishing in Europe nuclear-free zones and zones free from chemical weapons.

Washington holds an opposite stand. U.S. militaristic circles regard, and not without ground, the ideas of establishing zones free from chemical weapons as an obstacle to their plans of deploying in Europe the newest types of that barbarous means of mass destruction -- binary chemical munitions. Chemical weapons are by their nature the aggressor weapons. Besides, as was shown by the U.S. dirty war in Vietnam, it is spearheaded mainly against civilians who do not have, as different from the army, sufficient anti-chemical protection means. In the Pentagon's European arsenals, located thousands miles away from the U.S. shores, chemical weapons have now been stockpiled in quantities sufficient to destroy the whole population of Europe many times. And now the U.S. plans to bring to Europe an even more sophisticated -- binary weapons, pressing by hook or by crook for the consent of the NATO allies [sentence as received]. This is why an exceedingly timely was the call of the leaders of Bulgaria and Romania to the neighbours that the negotiations be opened without delay to attain an agreement between the Balkan countries on renunciation of the use, production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons on their territory.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1206

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: U.S., ALLIES HAMPER PROGRESS AT CDE SESSION

LD201230 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Stockholm, December 20 TASS -- TASS special correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Aleksandr Stepanenko write:

The scheduled session of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has closed in the Swedish capital today. Its results can be evaluated as positive on the whole, said Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation. The recent Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva has had a positive impact on the session in Stockholm. The atmosphere at the conference has become more businesslike, a range of questions has been outlined that could make the contours of a future agreement, coordinators have been named for drafting the final document.

The main trends in the work of the Stockholm forum are determined by the proposals of the socialist countries, which provide both for concrete commitment on non-use of force and confidence-building measures in the military field.

At the same time, the USA and some of its allies are hampering progress. They are preventing the effort to make concrete and effective the principle of non-use of force and outline measures for the notification on exercises of such strike arms of the service as the air force and the navy in the sea (oceanic) area and airspace adjoining Europe.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1206

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. CONTINUES NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS DESPITE BAN

LD151126 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Dec 85

[From the "Moscow Viewpoint" program; commentary by Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpts] The United States carried out yet another nuclear test at the Nevada proving ground a few days ago. The test, code named "Hawk's Nest," was the 15th nuclear explosion to be set off by the United States this year. There's no doubt therefore that Washington has turned a deaf ear to the Soviet Union's invitation to join it in suspending nuclear tests. The Soviet Union did so on 6 August. In the opinion of its leaders, to suspend nuclear tests on a mutual basis would be a concrete step toward ending the arms race.

The Soviet initiative got a chilly reception in the American capital. At first Washington dismissed it as a propaganda ploy and claimed verification problems. But when America later on carried out a nuclear test, Soviet and foreign experts promptly came up with its characteristics, though the Pentagon had made no formal announcement. After this the talk of verification problems died down somewhat but instead the Americans began claiming that a nuclear arms moratorium or ban would be just a partial measure which would in no way help to tackle the whole problem. Therefore they claimed, it's necessary to pursue global solutions instead of dissipating efforts. Only those who want to continue the nuclear arms race at any cost can think so.

Yet the United States continues its test program. You can talk as much as you please of your goodwill and desire to rid mankind of the nuclear threat, but you can prove your intentions with practical moves alone. Just compare the Soviet and the American attitude to the problem of nuclear tests and you'll see who is really trying to stop the disastrous nuclear arms race and who merely pays lip service to this necessity. Today is 14 Decmeber. The Soviet moratorium expires on 1 January. The Soviet Government has warned that if the United States followed its example its moratorium might last indefinitely. A lack of response on the part of America would force the Soviet Union to resume tests.

As Soviet leaders have said more than once their country cannot allow anyone to attain superiority over it. There's still enough time for Washington to display its political realism and goodwill.

/8918
CSO: 5200/1199

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET COMMENT ON U.S. RESPONSE TO USSR'S NEW MORATORIUM

U.S. 'Does Not Agree to Idea'

LD191927 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1858 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, 19 Dec (TASS) -- The White House has again rejected the idea of introducing a moratorium on nuclear tests. A personal spokesman for the President made a statement today saying that the United States of America "does not agree" to this idea. He made it clear that the United States would continue to conduct nuclear tests, which, as he asserted, "are necessary in order to ensure the effectiveness and reliability of nuclear arsenals." As observers note in this regard, the United States conducts nuclear tests for another quite specific purpose as well -- to accelerate the development [razrabotka] and creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements.

U.S. 'Propaganda Stunt'

LD200759 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, 20 Dec (TASS) - TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reports that the United States has once again rejected the idea of introducing a moratorium on nuclear explosions. As a representative of the President stated, the United States "does not agree" with the moratorium. He implied that the U.S. Administration does intend to continue nuclear tests. The representative affirmed that they are "necessary," since this is the only way the United States can guarantee "preserving the efficiency and reliability" of its nuclear potential.

Commenting on this statement by the White House representative, observers emphasize that the refusal of the Washington administration to join the Soviet Union and ban all nuclear tests is caused by its policy of further stepping up the U.S. nuclear arsenals and of quantitatively and qualitatively renewing them. What is more, the "star wars" program is linked to the continuation of nuclear tests.

In spite of the administration's affirmations that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is supposed to "do away" with nuclear arms, some of the weapons systems developed [razrabotannykh] within the framework of this program, and which are meant to be put into outer space, are based on just this principle of the use of the energy of nuclear explosions.

Having rejected the idea of the moratorium once again, the White House has attempted to present the matter as if, in general, it were not against "a comprehensive test ban," as if such a ban were a "long-term goal" of the administration. But the President's representative hedged the achievement of a ban with so many conditions and reservations that it is clear: the declared readiness to go for the introduction of a ban on nuclear weapons is nothing else but a propaganda stunt which is supposed to stifle the protests of the world and the U.S. public.

U.S. Blasts Continue

LD210020 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 21 Dec 85

[Video talk by Soviet television political observer Valentin Zorin on the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The U.S. press has reported a new, big underground nuclear weapons test at the test site in the State of Nevada. Here is Valentin Zorin, Soviet television political observer:

Hello, comrades. One gets the impression that the Pentagon has, with feverish haste, been attempting to close all the paths leading to a joint Soviet-U.S. cessation of all nuclear weapons tests. It is noteworthy that this condemnable activity has been stepped up as the current year comes to a close. A matter of days now remain before 1 January 1986, the date when the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on all nuclear explosions expires. This is now the fifth month that our country has not carried out such test explosions.

Well, it is clear to any sensible person that it was no simple matter to embark on such a step. For precisely this reason, the period for our moratorium is limited to the beginning of 1986. However, in announcing the cessation of nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union stated that the moratorium would continue to operate after 1 January if the United States were to follow our example and refrain from conducting nuclear explosions. In that event, the equilibrium would not be disturbed and an effective obstacle would be set in the way of a further buildup of the nuclear arms race. It is quite obvious that the creation of new and ever more destructive and dangerous forms of nuclear weapons is impossible without conducting tests. The Soviet Union proposed a realistic and at the same time, highly effective step toward halting the nuclear arms race. This is precisely how the Soviet initiative was appraised around the world.

Unfortuantely, it has to be stated that influential Washington circles have still not reacted to Moscow's initiative and have not followed our example. The blasts of explosions continue to be heard at the U.S. test sites. Proceeding on the basis of their own selfish interests and displaying hopeless narrow-mindedness, the Pentagon leadership is striving to suppress the sober voices that are also being heard in the U.S. capital, to present those who realize or are beginning to realize the danger of such a course with a fait accompli and to torpedo the very idea of a cessation of nuclear tests.

Only a very little time remains before the period of the moratorium which the Soviet Union announced expires: just 12 days. However, this is enough time to avoid missing a unique chance which would pave the way to the prohibition of all nuclear weapons tests. It is now up to Washington. The coming days will show whether it will be able to display political courage, farsightedness, goodwill, and a striving to follow the spirit of the Geneva accords.

U.S. Nuclear Explosion Postponed

LD212144 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 21 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Magari writes:

According to reports that from the United States, an underground nuclear explosion planned for December 19, during which a nuclear-pumped laser was to be used, has been put off. This fact draws the attention, above all, for the reason that the deadline of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions imposed on August 6 expires on January 1. The moratorium, however, might be prolonged if the United States joins in it.

Regrettably, there were no such signs from the United States till now. References were made, specifically, to difficulties of verification, though it is well known that both the Soviet Union and the United States have quite perfect national technical means which can reliably ensure the confidence of the sides that the moratorium is observed.

For purposes of enhancing effective control, the Soviet side suggested making use of the proposal of six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- for setting up on their territories special tracking stations for observance over the implementation of arrangements on the cessation of tests.

The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. It wishes, while establishing mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions now, to agree with the United States also on some measures for on-the-spot verification to remove possible doubts about the observance of such a moratorium.

As is justly recognized by many observers, these proposals opened up practical possibilities for a mutually acceptable solution of the question of mutual moratorium.

So what does the United States decision to put off an underground nuclear explosion mean? Is it a response to the recent Soviet proposals on verification? If so, then the possibility to get off the ground the solution of the problem of nuclear tests assumes real outlines. This is why that fact has not passed unnoticed. Many would like to see in it the sign of hope that the voice of reason starts prevailing among those who are shaping the United States nuclear policy. If the United States really intends to join in the moratorium it could become a good augury for the coming year 1986.

'Moment of Truth' Arises

LD232315 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1944 GMT 23 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Kozin]

[Text] As in peoples' lives, moments arrive in the lives of states and governments when words start losing their meaning and what is needed are deeds, specific decisions of principle. Such a moment has arrived in the mutual relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The moment of truth is here. Mayakovskiy remarked in his time that words get shabby with use just like a suit. If one were to count all the repetitions of the allegedly peace-loving statements made in Washington, then it becomes clear that the ideological wardrobe has not only grown shabby, but has already become simply worn out. The hopes which mankind put on the meeting in Geneva boiled down to a constructive approach to halting the arms race being outlined. We justified these hopes. You know, comrades, that the Soviet Union has come forward with a number of business-like proposals, intelligible to all.

One of these concerns nuclear blasts. We unilaterally announced a moratorium on any nuclear tests, giving the other side almost 6 months for reflection. It would seem simple and clear -- we would not test weapons, there would be no new types of weapons either. We have not carried out a single test since the beginning of August, when the moratorium was announced, to the present day. Despite the fact that the earth continued to shake with explosions from testing in the State of Nevada, we believed that common sense would nevertheless prevail.

However, puffs of verbal smoke are again dispersing from Washington, which are aimed at masking the administration's unwillingness to respond to the Soviet Union's initiative. Deputy White House press secretary Speakes, in essence rejecting our proposal, made a statement from which it follows that the question of halting nuclear blasts cannot be solved, until a fundamental reduction of nuclear arsenals on both sides is achieved.

The world has already been a witness many times to how the constructive approaches of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have come up against reservations and unacceptable conditions. It seems that yet another example of such an approach is at hand. We made a proposal to the U.S. President on a moratorium in order to demonstrate the mutual striving of both countries toward ending the arms race. A first step is necessary in any matter. A joint ban on nuclear tests could be such a step, could give a real impulse to the whole process of Soviet-U.S. talks.

U.S. Shows 'Unwillingness'

LD232010 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 23 Dec 85

["United States Is for Continuation of Nuclear Explosions" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

The summing up of the argumentation advanced by Washington in the past five years against the termination of nuclear weapon tests by the USA, the U.S. attitude to the moratorium on nuclear explosions give one a clearer notion of real aims of the foreign policy of the present U.S. Adminstration than all the speeches of its representatives about the need to make nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

The problem of nuclear weapon tests is the touchstone which exposes the real attitude of some or other government to the very idea of arms limitation and reduction through talks.

In July 1980, that is prior to the coming of the present administration to the White House, the U.S. delegation at the talks with the USSR and Britain signed a joint document which said, specifically, that the ban on nuclear tests in all the media will be a large contribution to the achievement of universal aims of checking the nuclear arms race. But in the same year of 1980, when the entire text of the future agreement was virtually agreed upon, the United States, without any explanation, unilaterally disrupted the talks on comprehensive test ban. And in July 1982 the present U.S. Administration announced that it does not intend to resume the talks in the foreseeable future.

After the Soviet Union, on August 6 of this year, announced unilaterally a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and urged the United States to follow suit, Washington came out with a statement that the existing means of verification of the observance of the ban on testing are allegedly not effective enough and ostentatiously held tests of a nuclear device at the range in Nevada.

Striving to get the question of the ban on nuclear tests off the ground, the Soviet Union recently proposed to the United States to take advantage of the consent of a number of states to the setting up in their territories of special stations for monitoring the implementation of the agreements and proclaimed its readiness, while establishing mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, also to agree on certain measures of on-the-spot verification.

The United States which until recently was advancing on-the-spot verification as a term on which it can join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosion has now pulled back. They in Washington declared that solution of the problems of verification alone is not enough, that the United States can be discussing the termination of nuclear explosions only after the conclusion of the modernisation of U.S. nuclear weapon systems which need to be tested.

It is well-known that altogether the United States has staged the number of nuclear weapon tests that is at least one third greater than the number of tests by the Soviet Union. In conditions of the strategic balance between the USSR and the USA, the Pentagon's intention to continue nuclear tests unilaterally shows only that contrary to its declarations the White House has not given up the aim of achieving military superiority.

It is not for the first time in the past five years that Washington has shown the United States unwillingness to decide the problems of removing the danger of nuclear war, has shown that, just like a gambleer, it continued to disregard vital interests of all peoples, including the American people.

Speakes Announces Refusal

LD231450 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 23 Dec 85

["USA Refuses to Introduce Moratorium"—TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, December 23 TASS -- As was already reported, a few days ago deputy press secretary of the White House Larry Speakes at his press conference answered in the negative to the Soviet proposal of a moratorium on any nuclear explosions.

From Larry Speakes' pronouncements it is clear that the question of a moratorium, even more so, termination of nuclear tests, cannot be resolved until a substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals on both sides is attained. Such an argument, if one may call it so, is at least strange. If this logic is to be followed, even relatively simple things, such as for instance, a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, would be postponed for an uncertain period of time.

The aim of the Soviet Union's address to the U.S. President on the question of the moratorium was to demonstrate the real and mutual intention of the USSR and the USA to lead things to a halt in the nuclear arms race. There are no really weighty reasons for the two countries, the Soviet Union and the USA, not to undertake a joint step -- to stop nuclear explosions. That would be a tangible step which would surely give a strong impetus to the whole process of negotiations on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva. It would be to the personal credit of the leaders of the two countries to solve that issue.

Speakes Remarks Deplored

PM231110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Who is Against the Moratorium? L. Speakes: White House 'Disagrees'; Public Alarmed"]

[Text] Washington, 20 Dec -- As is well known, a camera obscura is a device which gives a distorted view of a subject.

It seems that the principle of its operation is very popular in Washington. It has again been put into action here in order to confuse U.S. public opinion and mask the administration's reluctance to make concrete efforts to stop the nuclear arms race.

White House spokesman L. Speakes received a hail of questions from journalists at today's press conference. Launching into unsubstantiated claims about the United States' "long-standing desire" to limit nuclear tests, Speakes turned everything upside down, to put it mildly. It followed from what he said that Washington dreams only of "setting in motion a process which could strengthen trust and cooperation between the two countries as regards limitations on nuclear tests" and that this is the administration's "long-term goal."

As for the specific question of joining the USSR's unilateral moratorium, the response was unambiguous -- the United States "disagrees."

The motive behind the Washington position he set out is no secret. And Speakes did not consider it possible to hide the fact that the U.S. refusal to introduce a ban on nuclear tests is explained by its intention to continue building up and improving the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The White House spokesman just stated: "U.S. tests are needed to ensure the effectiveness of our means of deterrence and to ensure the reliability" of U.S. nuclear arsenals.

Moreover, according to Speakes, the Pentagon needs to carry out nuclear explosions in order to expedite the highly dangerous "star wars" program. As THE WASHINGTON POST wrote the other day, it is a question of the development [razrabotka] of nuclear devices which it is planned to deploy in low earth orbit.

"In my opinion, the Soviet Union is absolutely right to offer to introduce a joint moratorium with the United States on nuclear tests, which would help prevent the militarization of space," Admiral G. LaRocque, retired, director of the prestigious Center for Defense Information, stated in conversation with your correspondent. "The USSR's readiness to extend the moratorium is a most important act and one can only regret that the administration refuses to support it and refuses to take the opportunity to take a substantial step in slowing the arms race."

The well-known specialist categorically rejected the White House "arguments" according to which the system of verification is "inadequate." "The references to monitoring difficulties are groundless; the existing means make it possible to monitor the fulfillment of accords with total certainty," LaRocque pointed out. Moreover, he noted, the USSR -- and this is very important -- is prepared to reach agreement with the United States on certain onsite monitoring measures. Thus, in his words, it is "politics and by no means technology that is the major stumbling block for the United States in reaching new agreements with the Soviet Union." The U.S. excuses, the director of the center said, are being used to camouflage a reluctance to take vitally important steps.

The Center for Defense Information in the person of its director is by no means alone in this opinion. When asked to comment on the administration's stance, T. (Ferrer), a leader of the mass social organization "Nuclear Freeze Campaign," stated: We are very disappointed that our government has not made a positive response to the Soviet proposal. That is truly tragic. We are missing an historic opportunity to stop the arms race by supporting the constructive Soviet position. Washington's actions mean that the peace-loving Americans throughout the country, will continue the active struggle to ban nuclear tests.

In other words, the progressive U.S. public is frankly disenchanted with the administration's stance, which is blatantly at odds with the imperative of the time and the demands of universal security and peace.

Now that political will is so necessary in order to progress down the road of taking concrete measures to curb the arms race and implementing the positive results of the Geneva summit, Washington is showing its lack of such will. Yet, as sober-minded Americans believe, it is the removal of tension and the military threat, not the creation of demagogic "smokescreens," that accords with the aspirations of all the peoples, including the American people.

'Deceitful' Maneuver

PM241619 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Matveyev "Rejoinder": "A New Maneuver?"]

[Text] An avalanche of appeals addressed to the U.S. government from national and international organizations representing various public, scientific, and other circles in the world, as well as demands from many governments to respond positively to the Soviet initiative to join moratorium on all nuclear tests, are placing Washington in an increasingly difficult position.

By voting at the UN General Assembly session, which has just ended, against the resolution on the immediate ending and banning of nuclear weapons tests -- a resolution which was adopted by the majority of states belonging to the organization (only the British and French delegates voted with the United States against the resolution) -- U.S. official representatives have set themselves against the world community.

Judging from U.S. press reports, which draw information from government departments, people there are now engaged in developing new propaganda methods designed to weaken the sharply negative response in the world to the U.S. Administration's position on this question.

Here is what THE LOS ANGELES TIMES wrote the other day in a report from Washington: "White House officials announced that the Reagan administration is soon expected to agree to the Russians' proposal on concluding a new agreement on a nuclear test ban. At the same time they hinted that the United States will markedly lower the target of such talks. One high-ranking official observed that there will be no attempts to secure an all-embracing ban, since the Russians will consider the aim of the talks unacceptable."

So we have an "initiative" calculated to be rejected!

Instead of seeking a complete, comprehensive ban on nuclear tests, as is demanded by practically all the UN states with the exception of the three Western nuclear powers, we have a deceitful maneuver designed to give the impression of some kind of "flexibility" on the part of official Washington. That is the essence of what the aforementioned U.S. newspaper wrote.

No cosmetics can gloss over a position contrary to the vital interests of the cause of peace and international security. What is needed is not propaganda tricks, but serious, practical steps to radically resolve the problem.

'Sincerity' in 'Doubt'

LD251841 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 25 Dec 85

["U.S. Goodwill is Needed" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 25 TASS -- TASS political news analyst for military issues Vladimir Bogachev writes:

According to the UPI news agency, a representative of the U.S. administration who asked not to be identified said that President Reagan would examine any Soviet proposal on the on-site control, but he would not agree to the discontinuation of nuclear test explosions.

The question arises: What is Washington going to control on site if the U.S. intends to go on with nuclear explosions? What is the purpose of this control proposed by the White House, if the U.S. refuses so much as to discuss the resumption of talks on the general and complete banning of nuclear tests? Washington has not given any intelligible answer to these questions so far.

On August 6 the Soviet Union stopped nuclear weapons tests and nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, urged the U.S. to follow its example, expressed readiness to effect control over the observance of the mutual moratorium using the international verification system and some on-site inspection measures and suggested that the tripartite talks on a complete and general banning of nuclear weapons tests be resumed immediately without any delay, right at the beginning of the coming year.

Judging by the confused reaction of Washington, the U.S. ruling circles like, for some reason, in this broad program of the Soviet proposals only the on-site control. The White House does not agree either to the moratorium or to the resumption of the tripartite talks, or to the international verification system. The impression is that the present U.S. Administration would be very much pleased with a timeless Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, while the Pentagon would have a free hand in staging such explosions. However, Washington prefers to keep silent about its hopes for this development of events, for it realizes, and with good reason, that they are absolutely futile.

In Geneva President Reagan affirmed that the U.S. had given up the course towards the reaching of military superiority. Washington's present stand on the problem of the termination of nuclear explosions makes one doubt the sincerity of Washington's peaceful declarations.

Specialists point out with good reason that the problem of the discontinuation of nuclear tests is a touchstone permitting to determine rather accurately the true stand of this or that government with regard to a whole complex of questions connected with the limitation and reduction of armaments.

There is every ground for coming to the conclusion that it is not the scientific and technological factors that are the main obstacle on the way to reaching agreement on the discontinuation of nuclear explosions. It is the U.S. political goodwill that is needed for the mutually acceptable solution of the tests problem.

Time for 'Responsible Decision'

LD252039 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 25 Dec 85

[Commentary by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Our country unilaterally adopted the decision to halt nuclear weapon tests last August and has declared its readiness to prolong this moratorium beyond 1 January of next year if the United States also joins it. What position is taken in Washington on this most important question? They are maneuvering with regard to this for the time being. They in the U.S. capital initially said everything was allegedly held up by the verification problem.

However, the full groundlessness of such excuses soon became clear. It became quite obvious that any nuclear blasts can be fully verified by national technical facilities.

This was confirmed, in particular, after the United States carried out an unannounced blast of low power which was immediately registered. Moreover, six states situated on various continents -- Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania, and Sweden -- have proposed setting up special stations to monitor the termination of nuclear tests on their territories. Apart from this, the USSR is also prepared to reach agreement with the United States regarding some verification measures directly at the sites of such tests. Thus, references to some sort of verification difficulty have totally faded away. Nevertheless, they in Washington continue to reject the very notion of a nuclear test moratorium. A highly placed administration representative, whose surname, it is true, is not cited, has recently spoken along those lines.

What are the reasons for such stubborness? The reply to this question is supplied by reports coming from the Pentagon these days. As THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper writes, referring to official U.S.A. war department representatives, here, even notwithstanding a recent legislative ban by Congress on antisatellite weapons tests, they are continuing to speed up various "star wars" programs. It is proposed to make wide use of nuclear weapons in them as well, in particular as a source of superpowerful laser radiation. The major concerns which have joined in the implementation of the Pentagon's military-space programs have already scented, as the U.S. press itself puts it, the smell of something frying and do not wish to leave the biggest feeding trough. But what for the monopolies is a feeding trough, may become a nuclear snare for the whole of mankind. U.S. scientists themselves are warning against this increasingly insistently, as they appeal for the USSR's example to be followed and for nuclear blasts to be stopped. Washington still has time to adopt a responsible decision.

'Omen' of Test Postponement

PM241747 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[V. Nikolayev "Rejoinder": "What Is the Meaning of This Fact?"]

[Text] According to reports from the United States, the planned underground nuclear explosion in the course of which the so-called nuclear-triggered laser was to have been used has been postponed. This fact is attracting attention especially because the moratorium on nuclear explosions, declared unilaterally by the Soviet Union on 6 August this year, expires on 1 January, but may be extended if the United States decides to join it.

Until recently, however, there was no indication to this effect from the U.S. side. Difficulties in monitoring were cited in particular, although it is well known that both the Soviet Union and the United States have highly sophisticated national technical means at their disposal which make it possible to reliably ensure the sides' confidence that the moratorium is being observed.

With the aim of enhancing effective monitoring, the Soviet side has proposed that the offer made by six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- to set up special stations on their territories to monitor the implementation of the accords on ending the tests should be taken up.

The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. Provided a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions is established now, it is prepared to come to an agreement with the United States on certain measures of on-site monitoring to eliminate possible doubts about the observance of such a moratorium.

Many observers rightly acknowledge that these proposals have opened up practical possibilities for a mutually acceptable solution to be achieved on the question of a mutual moratorium.

And so what does the U.S. decision to postpone the underground nuclear explosion mean? Is it a reaction to the recent Soviet proposals on monitoring? If this is the case, then the possibility of overcoming the impasse in the solution of the problem of nuclear tests is taking on realistic features. This is why this fact did not pass unnoticed. Many people would like to see it as a sign of hope that the voice of reason is gaining the upper hand among the U.S. nuclear policy makers. If the United States really intends to join the moratorium, then this could be a good omen for 1986.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1208

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR NOTES FOREIGN REACTION TO SOVIET PROPOSAL

Hungary's Varkonyi

LD211543 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 21 Dec 85

[Text] Budapest, December 21 TASS -- The Hungarian Government fully supports the Soviet Union's efforts and tangible proposals directed towards a radical reduction in nuclear arms and towards prevention of the arms race's spreading over to outer space, Peter Varkonyi, Hungarian minister of foreign affairs, stated in a speech at the session of the National Assembly of the Hungarian People's Republic today.

He described as a vivid manifestation of the USSR's political will for the strengthening of peace and for the development of international cooperation the Soviet side's unilaterally announced moratorium on nuclear explosions as well as its proposal to the United States to follow suit. "Time permits of no delay in this important matter. However, there is still no positive reply on the part of the United States", the minister said.

He gave a high appraisal of the statement made by the Soviet side recently that, upon announcing a Soviet-U.S. moratorium on nuclear explosions, it would be possible to agree also on certain kinds of on-site inspection if such necessity arises. Hungary also supports the Soviet proposal to resume the tripartite Soviet-U.S.-British talks on a total ban on nuclear weapon testing, the minister pointed out.

Bulgarian Deputy Defense Minister

LD241227 Moscow TASS in English 1148 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Sofia, December 24 TASS -- More than five months have passed but the American side has not yet given a positive reply to the Soviet Union's appeal for the USA to accede to the Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions, Mariy Ivanov, first deputy foreign minister of Bulgaria, said in an interview with TASS correspondent Yuriy Tyssovskiy. There is only one week left before the expiration of the term of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium, he stressed. Will mankind's hopes for a lasting peace and detente be revived? The meeting in Geneva showed that such opportunities exist and that it is now necessary to support words by concrete actions.

The Soviet moratorium, Mariy Ivanov said, is a new manifestation of the Soviet Union's sincere desire to create appropriate conditions for a decisive turn in international relations, a turn for detente and termination of nuclear weapon tests would become a serious barrier in the way of development of such weapons and become a condition without which any reduction and complete elimination of the existing nuclear arsenals are inconceivable. At the same time the Soviet Union suggested a series of effective measures to verify the observance of the moratorium and is prepared to discuss any other measures towards this end. There exist all the necessary conditions now for removing the nuclear danger that is hanging over mankind. The only thing needed is political goodwill and realism. It is now up to the United States, Mariy Ivanov stressed.

Pugwash Movement Statement

LD232029 Moscow TASS in English 2009 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS -- Soviet scientists, members of the international Pugwash movement of scientists, have issued a statement addressed to the U.S. President and Administration and expressing their profound concern about the escalating nuclear arms race and the mortal danger threatening mankind.

An end to all nuclear weapons testing, they said, would be an important measure helping to ward off the nuclear threat which can only be removed by joint efforts.

The Soviet scientists are convinced that continued nuclear testing fuels the nuclear arms race, provides a source of growing international tension and increases the war threat. "This is why we urge the U.S. President and Administration to join the Soviet Union's moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which would positively develop the process started by the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva in terms of practical measures to halt the nuclear arms race," the statement said.

"The term of the announced Soviet moratorium expires on January 1, 1986. So there still is time, although it is fast running out. We hope that statesmanship and political realism will prevail over mistrust and an important step will be taken towards concluding a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear test ban," the statement said.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1208

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: ADELMAN REJECTS PROPOSAL TO END NUCLEAR TESTING

LD161626 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 16 Dec 85

[Text] New Delhi, December 16, TASS--TASS correspondent Vladimir Baydashin reports: The United States has a negative view of a proposal by the heads of state and government of six countries, including India, Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania, Greece and Sweden, for a total end to the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems as well as of space arms. This has been admitted bluntly by Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Speaking in an interview with the Indian newspaper HINDUSTAN TIMES, he did not conceal that the United States would continue conducting nuclear testing because, he claimed, "it helps develop newer, more reliable, atomic weapons." Contrary to common sense, Adelman maintained that the continued upgrading of nuclear weapons "leads to strategic arms reductions" and that a comprehensive nuclear test ban would not "help build a more stable world."

He declared hypocritically that the arms race in the South Asian subcontinent "bothers us very much" and that it was that factor that the U.S. Administration took into account when considering sales of any new technologies, including military technologies, to India. He did not say, however, that direct responsibility for the tension in the region is borne by the United States which has been whipping up the arms race in South Asia all the time with its large-scale supplies of newest American weaponry to Pakistan.

The Washington administration official did not make any bones about admitting that the United States intended to continue executing a policy of blackmail and dictate towards India. He said in no uncertain terms, for instance, that India could not count on buying modern electronic hardware in the United States as long as it had a "very close relationship" with the Soviet Union.

/8918
CSO: 5200/1199

TASS CITES U.S. ORGANIZATION'S APPEAL FOR MORATORIUM

LD110902 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 11 Nov 85

[Text] San Francisco, November 11, TASS--The Washington-based Center for Defense Information has urged President Reagan to follow the example of the Soviet Union without delay and impose a moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

The Soviet Union, it said in an appeal published in the Califorian press, had taken a number of new bold steps which had drawn the attention of the entire world, including the termination of nuclear testing from August 6, 1985, to January 1, 1986.

The USSR had declared, the Center for Defense Information noted, that the moratorium would remain in effect also after that date if the United States followed its lead, but the United States had responded to the new Soviet initiative with more nuclear blasts and conducted 14 trials at the Nevada testing range this year alone.

The appeal rejected false claims by Washington spokesman that the continued testing was needed to "catch up with the Soviet Union." [Words indistinct] they said, the United States had the world lead in the number of nuclear explosions staged, which had amounted to 770 from 1945 to 1985.

/8918
CSO: 5200/1199

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR REPORTS, COMMENTS ON NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE CONFERENCE

Conference Opens

LD291343 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 29 Nov 85

[Text] Copenhagen, November 29, TASS--TASS correspondent Valeriy Loskutov reports:

A 2-day conference of parliamentarians of Nordic countries on establishing a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe opened here today. It is held on the initiative of the Social Democratic Party of Denmark. The forum is attended by more than 100 parliamentarians, prominent politicians of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Greenland, Faroe and Aland Islands.

The envoys of Scandinavian countries will discuss topical questions of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the region, exchange experience of parliamentary discussions on the topic, discuss further steps aimed at making the north of the continent a zone free from nuclear weapons.

Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Denmark, former Prime Minister Anker Jorgensen, has addressed a speech of greetings to the participants in the conference. He noted the importance of the quest for the alternative to the arms race, the topicality of the idea of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe. Reports were then made by prime minister of Sweden Olof Palme and president of Norway's Storting Josef Benkow.

With the conference having opened, the envoys of peace fighters of Nordic countries staged a mass demonstration and a flambeaux processing outside the Danish Parliament, forming a human chain around it. The manifestations called upon the parliaments and the governments of Nordic countries to take undelayed steps to bridle the arms race on earth, to prevent it from spreading to outer space, to promote detente and disarmament.

"The Nordic countries could take an important, independent and peaceful step with a view of concluding a treaty on the non-nuclear status of the north of Europe. This is the desire of the majority of the population of all countries of the region. The governments of Finland and Sweden, the parliaments of Denmark, Greenland and Faroe Islands have already declared support for the nuclear-free zone idea," it is said in the appeal.

"We expect the Copenhagen conference of parliamentarians to promote urgent, concrete and efficient steps on the part of parliaments and governments of all Nordic countries in 1986, which has been announced [in] the international peace year by the UN decision, to materialize the demand of the peoples of the countries of the region that a treaty-sealed nuclear-free zone be established in the north of Europe."

TASS Cites Speeches

LD301504 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 30 Nov 85

[Text] Copenhagen, November 30, TASS--TASS correspondent Valeriy Loskutov reports:

The first day of the conference of the MPS of the Nordic countries on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe has closed here. The delegates to the forum representing nearly 50 political parties of the countries of the region have discussed a wide range of issues in connection with the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the north of the continent.

In his report Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme pointed out that the joint Soviet-American statement at Geneva is a highly important basis for the discussion of the issue of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the region. He stressed that the proclamation of the Nordic countries to be an area free from nuclear weapons would lessen the danger of a nuclear war breaking out.

Similar stands have been set out from the rostrum of the conference by Kalevi Sorsa, Finland's prime minister, Gro Harlem Brundtland, chairman of the Norwegian Labour Party, and Anker Joergensen, former Danish prime minister. Kalevi Sorsa stressed that the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Nordic Europe is of an exceptional significance for ensuring international security. He said that the idea to turn the European north into a zone free from nuclear weapons is the cornerstone of Finland's foreign policy. Finnish MP Erkki Pystynen read out an appeal by the leaders of Finland's political parties represented in the parliament to the governments of the Nordic countries. It calls for intensifying efforts in the interests of creating a nuclear-free zone in the region. The appeal expresses support for the striving for international detence, disarmament and stability in the north of Europe.

Representatives of the ruling parties of Norway, Denmark and Iceland--NATO member-countries--have taken a negative stand on the issue of a nuclear-free zone. They deny the possibility of establishing it and insist that this first takes a preliminary coordination of their steps concerning the establishment of such a zone with the NATO leadership.

The conference will continue in session today.

Nordic Parliamentarians Call for NFZ

LD022217 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 2--TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov Writes:

The supporters of the idea of a nuclear free zone in the north of Europe deem it necessary to take concrete steps toward its early implementation. Such is the essence of a joint statement of Social Democratic parties of North European countries which they made in Copenhagen at a conference of parliamentarians of Nordic countries.

The social democrats advanced an initiative to set up an interparliamentary working group to tackle practical matters for turning the north of Europe into a nuclear free zone and urged the governments of Nordic countries to set up a joint interparliamentary group which would get down in real earnest to practical problems of a nuclear free North.

Such are the demands of the majority among the 100 members of parliament from Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Finland who took part in the Copenhagen forum. They are supported by Sweden's Prime Minister Olof Palme who confirmed at the conference the resolve to press not only for turning northern Europe into a nuclear free zone, but also for creating in central Europe a zone free from battlefield nuclear weapons on both sides of the line separating NATO countries from the Warsaw Treaty countries. Finland's Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa proclaimed the readiness of the Finnish Government to discuss those problems at a governmental level. Norwegian Social Democrats suggested a draft treaty of Nordic countries on the creation of a nuclear free zone under which participating countries assume the commitment not to have or acquire nuclear weapons, not to allow other states or persons to bring in or store nuclear weapons, not to develop or produce such weapons.

A different tendency has also been manifested at the conference: A negative stand has been assumed by members of parliament from ruling bourgeois parties of NATO countries--Norway, Denmark, Iceland. They came to the conference clearly for the purpose to prevent a breakthrough toward creating a nuclear free North. They came only for the reason that they could no longer stay in their offices, declaring their loyalty to NATO, their Atlantic solidarity, trying to intimidate the peoples of their countries with the "Soviet menace" for too wide a scope has been assumed by the public movement for a nuclear free North, and bourgeois rulers are concerned that they might lose their prestige.

They advanced again their "arguments" which clearly reflect Washington's reasoning: There are no nuclear weapons in the north of Europe so far, so there is no need to proclaim it a nuclear free zone, forming such a zone could strike a blow at joint strategic concepts of the North Atlantic alliance, the actions of NATO countries should be agreed upon with NATO command, it would be better to wait and decide the question on the nuclear free North depending on the solution of global international problems. Viewing the very idea of a nuclear free North as "illusory, inessential, useless."

No resolutions have been adopted by the conference, but the very fact of convening such a representative forum with the participation of heads of governments of some states, leaders of Social Democratic parties, prominent parliamentarians and public figures shows that the peoples of those countries do not want to be the Pentagon's nuclear hostages and are striving to consolidate their security through proclaiming northern Europe a nuclear free zone.

Kuznetsov Commentary

LD112312 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1700 GMT 9 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program; Yuriy Kuznetsov Commentary]

[Text] The meeting which has ended in Copenhagen has, without a doubt, turned out successfully for the forces wanting peace in the Nordic countries. The subject of the meeting, which has for years engrossed millions of Scandinavians, appeared for the first time at the Copenhagen meeting as the subject of concrete and detailed discussion by officials from all these states.

The meeting was held at a high political level, with over a hundred participating parliamentarians from almost 50 political parties from the Nordic countries, as well as by some prime ministers and foreign ministers. The course of the talks stressed the importance and timeliness of the idea of a Nordic nuclear weapons-free zone, and the need for concrete measures to attain it. One could also clearly observe at the conference those forces that do not actually oppose the idea of a nuclear weapons-free Nordic zone, but in practice oppose its concrete realization. These forces, which were represented mainly by the NATO-inclined strata in the Nordic countries, among them the right-wing circles and governments of Norway and Denmark, stubbornly sabotaged the practical establishment of measures for realizing the zone. Among these forces one can clearly see a lack of desire to have anything to do with solutions which are not approved by the leaders of NATO, and Washington in particular, whose negative attitude toward nuclear weapons-free zones is well-known.

There was a suppression of any mention of the Soviet Union, which on many occasions has expressed support for the idea of nuclear weapons-free zones, including the Nordic ones. The Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed both its support for the idea of a nuclear-free North and its readiness to give the necessary guarantees to the participants of such a zone and to examine the possibilities for implementing certain appropriate measures on its own territory.

In the present international situation one may not belittle the slightest chance to promote lasting peace. Every concrete step toward reducing tension is important, including regional steps, writes Yuriy Kuznetsov. The leaders and supporters of NATO like to advertise their desire for peace; here is a real possibility to reinforce their statements with action, in giving support to a Nordic nuclear weapons-free zone.

But no! The conference did not approve a final document; that was spoiled chiefly by Norway's and Denmark's bourgeois governments, which pointed to differences of opinion on ways to realize the idea of the zone, and on the timing for it. But this, nevertheless, cannot mitigate the most important thing: the ever-growing interest of the Scandinavian populations in a zone free of nuclear weapons, and the clear interest of responsible Nordic politicians in realizing it. In this connection the Social

Democratic parties' initiative at the meeting for a joint Nordic commission of parliamentarians to be established on the question of a nordic nuclear weapons-free zone, a completely concrete proposal, was noteworthy. Such measures apparently reflect the ideas of the broad masses in the Nordic countries who expect from their politicians not words but deeds for real progress toward the reinforcement of peace and security in their area, concludes Yuriy Kuznetsov.

/8918
CSO: 5200/1199

TASS ON FRENCH NUCLEAR TEST ON MURUROA

South Pacific Condemns Test

LD250925 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT 25 Nov 85

[Text] Canberra, November 25, TASS--France has carried out another underground nuclear explosion at Mururua Atoll in the Pacific Ocean. This is the seventh French nuclear test this year, says a statement by Prime Minister David Lange of New Zealand. According to him, the yield of the explosion which was recorded by the New Zealand seismological laboratory at Cook Islands was about seven kilotons. David Lange has stressed that the population of the South Pacific strongly and unequivocally condemns French nuclear tests in the region.

Australian Protest

LD282237 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 28 Nov 85

[Text] Canberra, November 28, TASS--Australian Foreign Minister William Hayden has strongly protested against the nuclear tests conducted by France on Atoll Mururoa in the Pacific.

The foreign minister stresses in a statement for the press that, contrary to protests of the population of the Southern Pacific countries, France has already conducted 8 nuclear explosions with a total yield of about 250 kilotons since the beginning of this year. There are serious worries over the effect of these tests on the environment. Hayden condemns the actions of Paris, which continues to ignore the will of the Southern Pacific peoples who approve a treaty announcing that part of the Pacific a nuclear weapon-free zone.

Australia will continue firmly to seek an end to French nuclear tests in the Southern Pacific, the foreign minister stressed.

/8918
CSO: 5200/1199

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. PRESSES NEW ZEALAND TO CHANGE POLICY

LD161941 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 16 Dec 85

[Text] London, December 16, TASS--The United States is stepping up pressure on New Zealand to make the Lange government drop its anti-nuke policy. Seeking to break the resistance of Wellington, which has banned calls by nuclear-armed ships at the ports of the country and submitted to the Parliament a draft bill to make the ban law, the United States is showering threats at New Zealand. A U.S. Administration official has said in Washington that the decision was taken firmly to tell New Zealand that further military and economic cooperation was in jeopardy. Paul Wolfowitz, the U.S. assistant secretary of state for east Asian and Pacific affairs, was even more explicit: He said that Wellington would be denied access to the U.S. market.

Commenting on these statements, REUTERS points out that the United States has taken off diplomatic gloves in its relations with New Zealand. According to a Pentagon spokesman, the firm anti-nuke policy of the Lange government may set an undesirable political precedent.

Canberra, December 16, TASS--New Zealand will not revise its anti-nuke policy despite U.S. blackmail. The prime minister of the country said in Wellington that the New Zealanders were ignoring those threats.

The draft bill to ban U.S. nuclear-armed ships from New Zealand ports that is being debated by the Parliament enjoys broad support among the population of the island state. Last August New Zealand signed a treaty concluded by 13 participants in the session of the forum of the Southern Pacific countries to proclaim a nuclear weapon-free zone in that region.

/8918
CSO: 5200/1199

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: 638 JAPANESE AREAS DECLARED NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES

LD051211 Moscow TASS in English 1142 GMT 5 Nov 85

[Text] Tokyo, November 5, TASS--638 Japanese cities, townships and vast areas, including five prefectures, have been declared nuclear-free zones, the latest issue of the bulletin of nuclear-free cities reports. The movement of Japanese cities for nuclear-free peace zones on territories subordinate to local authorities has become one of the most active forms of the country's anti-war movement. Forty percent of the Japanese now live in these zones.

Anti-nuclear movement has swept hundreds of cities in the countries where the Pentagon intends to deploy or 18 deploying nuclear weapons. Some 400 cities in the Netherlands, 281 in Belgium, 170 in Italy, 160 in Britain and 154 in West Germany have already declared themselves nuclear-free.

/8918
CSO: 5200/1199

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

SOCIALIST STATES PRESENT RESOLUTION AT UN--New York, November 11, TASS--Delegations from socialist states to the First Committee of the UN General Assembly have called for a conclusion of a multi-lateral treaty banning tests of nuclear weapon by all states with a view to their total elimination. They tabled a draft resolution urging all states to apply maximum effort for the immediate elaboration and conclusion of such a treaty. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2215 GMT 11 Nov 85 LD] /8918

CSO: 5200/1199

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: 'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION--QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS', 13 DECEMBER

LD140045 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 13 Dec 85

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Pavel Kasparov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; with Kipras Mazheyka, station correspondent in Burssels; and Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, TASS military and political observer]

Summit 'Certain Success'

[Excerpt] [Kasparov] Hello, dear listeners. Letters are still coming into our editorial office expressing your wide support for the active peace policy being conducted by the Soviet state on the world scene. In particular, many letters to some extent or other, concern the results of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. I followed closely the talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Geneva, writes, among others, (Nadezhda Demyanovna Bayuk) from (Targan) village in Volodarka Rayon, Kiev Oblast, and I want to express my ardent support for the CPSU's peace-loving policy.

Pointing to the fact that the Soviet-U.S. meeting was a certain success, the authors of the letters nonetheless stress that it is a matter only of the first step in the business of reducing the present tension in the world. The political statements made in Geneva by both sides must be underpinned now by concrete decisions and deeds. Unfortunately, however, Washington's actions so far demonstrate the reverse, says listener (Byvaltsev) who lives in (Uvarovo) village, Mokrousova rayon in Kurgan Oblast, in his letter. While favoring a limitation of the nuclear threat to mankind in words, the United States at the same time is not stopping its nuclear tests. President Reagan, in my view, had hardly got back to Washington from Geneva when the papers were already reporting a new nuclear explosion by the United States, he stresses.

SDI Plans

Many other listeners also express concern at the policy of the present U.S. Administration in their letters. In particular, people are alarmed at Washington's obstinancy in clinging to the implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. This explains their desire to find out better what the so-called space shield is, which they constantly talk about across the ocean. Listeners (Shcherbina) from Nikolayev city, (Aleksandr Ivanovich Tyutrin) from Orekhovo-Zuyevo, (Boris Valentinovich Lizgachev) from Chkalovsk, Gorkiy Oblast, ask us to talk about it in more detail. The same request comes in a letter from Leningrad written by a schoolboy, but evidently an absent-minded one -- how else can one explain the fact that he forgot to put his name on the envelope? Many other listeners also ask us to talk about what the space defense system dreamed up in the United States is. I shall ask TASS military and political observer Vladimir Chernyshev, who is with me in the studio, to answer you. Over to you, Vladimir Nikolayevich:

[Chernyshev] Within the framework of SDI there are new, so-called exotic types of weaponry being developed [razrabatyvayutsya] -- laser, beam, electromagnetic cannons. Another category of weaponry is a new type of homing antimissile, that is a missile interceptor. This weaponry is supposed to be deployed both on earth and in space on battle platforms and is also to be delivered by special rockets to the area of application. A specialized antisatellite weapon, which is now being widely developed in the United States, is also related to strike space weapons.

Strike space weapons have a number of properties unique to them, for example they have a global range of action. Strike space weapons sited in near-earth orbits and equipped with maneuvering systems, can appear at virtually any moment over the territory of any state and create a genuine threat to its security. The target of such weapons can be installations located both in space and in the atmosphere and on the surface of the earth. Space weapons of the laser and beam type will possess a high level of readiness for use and almost instantaneous action. Moreover, they are designed in effect for automatic use, excluding human participation, and therein lies their special danger.

There is much talk in the United States at present about the defensive nature of SDI, that is the utilization of strike space weapons against the missiles of the other side. This is only one aspect of the program. But even from this viewpoint SDI represents a big threat. After all, when covered with a space shield, nuclear means of attack will become even more dangerous.

This is how, for example, a new war scenario is presented in the Pentagon. First U.S. antisatellite complexes or strike space weapons will be put into action to take out Soviet space systems warning of a nuclear missile attack and communications control systems. At the same time, the first nuclear missile strike is made against the Soviet Union -- part of the U.S. strategic weapons and medium-range weapons systems. Here they calculate on decapitation, that is, taking out organs of state and higher military leadership and disarming the opposing side, thus destroying a considerable part of its strategic nuclear forces and other military targets and installations of military industrial potential. The antimissile defense system is entrusted with the task of intercepting in flight those remaining strategic weapons which would be launched as a retaliatory strike by the Soviet Union. Here the side which attacks first would keep part of its offensive forces as a means for blackmail and coercion.

And now let us take a look at how the antimissile shield itself will work. It will consist, as planned, of several succeeding frontiers or echelons. At first the United States talks of three echelons. Now there is already talk of five and seven echelons, but let's look at the very simplest -- a three-echelon, system of antimissile defense. The main role here is given to the first space echelon whose weapons will hit, as the authors of "star wars" calculate, missiles used in the retaliatory strike, and what is more will hit them while still over the territory of the Soviet Union at the initial, so-called acceleration stage of their trajectory up to a height of the order of 500 km. This is during about 2-5 minutes' time after the missiles take-off. This echelon is planned to consist of laser and beam weapons sited on dozens, or indeed hundreds of space battle platforms.

On the middle section of the flight trajectory the missiles that are still intact are opposed by the weapons of the second space echelon -- satellites with electromagnetic cannons and homing missiles. For example, one of the drafts envisages the siting in near-earth orbit of about 500 satellites and on each of them it is intended to site 40-50 interceptor missiles. The heights of the middle sector of the flight are from 500 to 1,200 km.

On the final stage of the trajectory, starting from heights of 100 to 800 km ending with heights to 9 to 15 km, the weapons of the third echelon come on stage -- ground-based long and close range antimissiles. Control of the entire antimissile defense system is supposed to be carried out with the help of a special automated quick-action system, capable of conducting all-embracing supervision of the earth surface and space. It is to discover missile launches, calculate the flight trajectories of them, identify and track the warheads, distribute them among hit weapons and give signals to the weaponry to operate.

However, this entire colossal complex can fulfill not only the functions of a shield, but also the task of a space sword. Strike space weapons, in the view of many of the most authoritative specialists can be extremely effectively used as offensive weapons, in space to attack and destroy satellites of the opposing side, on earth to hit control and communications centers, power stations, fuel stores, tankers, fields sown to grain crops and so on. In the words of John (Razzer) a U.S. specialist on lasers and an ardent champion of "star wars," with the help of lightning strikes from space it is possible to cause immediate fires in any country and to wreak damage which in 30 minutes can throw an industrial country back to the level of the 18th century.

[Kasparov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, Western propaganda is trying to instill in people the idea that the U.S. SDI will be able virtually to nullify the danger of a nuclear missile conflict arising. But can one talk about this seriously? In particular we are asked about this by our listener (Sokolova) from Moscow and (Yarovaya) from Petropavlovsk village in Voronezh Oblast. What can you say on this?

[Chernyshev] Well, first of all, it must be said that what the representatives of the U.S. Administration are trying to present is a distinctive myth, a certain covering for the stellar genie which they are trying to set loose from the bottle. In fact, the "star wars" program is an enormous danger to the whole of humanity. First and foremost it must be noted that this program will lead to an undermining of the military strategic parity and a destabilization of the strategic situation as a whole in the world. The logic of nuclear confrontation is such that the creation [sozdaniye] of strike space weapons does not at all pursue defensive goals, but is a course aimed at achieving military superiority. After all, back at the beginning of the seventies the Soviet Union and the United States together had come to the clear understanding that in conditions of parity of strategic offensive forces the acquisition by one side or an additional defensive potential would be equivalent to the acquisition by it of the potential for a first nuclear strike. Incidentally, this supposition, this mutual understanding was enshrined in 1972 in the Soviet-U.S. timeless treaty on limitation of antimissile defense systems.

It is perfectly natural that in conditions of deployment of strike space weapons the other side will not sit back and watch. To restore the violated balance, it will be forced to take measures in response, to step up it strategic potential, either by means of a direct build-up of offensive forces, or through additional defense means, or by means of the one and the other. But even if both sides have roughly equal systems of antimissile defense, even insignificant differences in their efficiency would irreversibly lead to a substantial undermining of military strategic parity.

In this way the appearance of strike space weapons could transform the present strategic balance into strategic chaos, and would inevitably lead to the disappearance of the very concept of stability, the basis of maintaining the peace in a nuclear age. There is also a second danger and an extremely grave one: the move to a new qualitatively and quantitatively more dangerous spiral in the arms race. The scale of military competiton would grow immeasurably. The arms race would acquire an irreversible character and would go out of control. Each country in that case would have the feeling at any time that it was losing in some way, and it would start feverishly seeking more and more new methods of response, and not only in space, but also on earth.

Thirdly, the implementation of the "star wars" program is inevitably linked with an undermining of existing accords on limiting the arms race and strengthening international security, and primarily the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems, which for many years, and at present, has been the cornerstone of the process of limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons.

And finally the creation [sozdaniye] of strike space weapons will incomparably increase the risk of a nuclear war arising. Such weapons are capable of engendering the most dangerous illusion, that it is possible to make the first nuclear strike from under the space shield, while a retaliatory strike can be prevented or at least softened. The spread in the United States of notions separate from reality, of their own invulnerability, may intensify the dream of nuclear superiority among some people in Washington. The likelihood of a nuclear war breaking out by accident will also increase. A situation would be created whereby decisions which are important in principle, and irreversible in consequences, would be taken essentially by machines without the participation of human reasoning.

Without taking account of political will or moral criteria, such a development of events could lead to a total catastrophe, even if the initial impulse were provided by an error, a miscalculation, a technical breakdown in the extremely complex computer systems. After all, the world public knows of numerous incidents in U.S. nuclear weapons, and also cases of false operations and false alarms in the anti-air, antimissile defense system of the United States. Such errors in conditions whereby space is literally crawling with strike weapons is fraught with the danger of universal catastrophe. The result would be the worst of all worlds -- a world in which there would be a combination of unreliable defense and an escalation of offensive systems. That is why, when it is proposed to the Soviet Union that instead of destroying nuclear arms, the arms race should spread to space as well, it says no firmly. Such a step would mean an intensification of the danger hanging over the world, of a new, insane expenditure of money.

In the nuclear age, life itself demands not competition in weapons, but joint efforts for the good of peace.

'NATO Marathon'

[Kasparov] Mention is frequently made in the press of the term NATO marathon or Atlantic marathon. Andrey Rostovtsev from Kishinev and serviceman Aleksandr Grunin from Abakan ask us to explain what the term means. Here to reply to your question is our correspondent in Brussels, Kirpas Mazheyka.

[Mazheyka] On the eve of the New Year -- and this means as a rule during the winter session of the council of the bloc -- The NATO leadership charts its course for the future. This time, plans were formulated not just for the forthcoming year, but also for the more distant future in light of the results of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit level meeting in Geneva. But it is evidently still not proving easy to surmount the stagnation in the thinking of the NATO strategists dating back to the period of missile fever. It is hard to find any other explanation for the adoption of a large-scale program for the build-up of conventional armaments at the present session of the Atlanticists. The program, incidentally, is designed to run to the end of the present century.

Washington was again the prime mover and the main fixer behind the dangerous venture. Behind all these plans lies a desire to accelerate cooperation among the military concerns of different countries and substantially to increase spending for militaristic purposes. Meanwhile, everyone has long been waiting for the NATO members to come up with a constructive counterstep which will meet the Soviet proposals half-way.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1193

PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS, 15 DECEMBER

PM151254 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Boris Averchenko "International Review" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Excerpt] There are 16 more calendar pages to be turned over, and a new year will dawn on earth. Preparing to welcome it with emotion as always, people wish primarily that it may be peaceful and tranquil, safe and prosperous. They also ponder over the year that is coming to an end. Through the fault of imperialism, it was a tense and disturbed year on earth. But the Soviet Union, together with the fraternal socialist countries and all peace-loving forces on the planet, succeeded in blocking the aggressive militarist circles' way to the unleashing of a new worldwide slaughter, and in preventing a nuclear conflagration. The most important event in the year that is drawing to a close was the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, which marked the beginning of a USSR-U.S. dialogue for the purpose of achieving a turn for the better in relations between the two greatest powers and improving the entire international atmosphere. The peoples look into the future with hope. They want to believe that the opportunities created by the Geneva meeting will be translated into real deeds and that the coming year will be a year of peaceful labor, a year filled with joy and accomplishments.

A Decisive Force

"THE CPSU CONSIDERS IT ITS INTERNATIONAL DUTY, TOGETHER WITH THE OTHER FRATERNAL PARTIES," the draft new edition of the CPSU Program says, "TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITY AND INCREASE THE MIGHT AND INFLUENCE OF THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY. The course of socialism's competition with capitalism and the future of world civilization depend to an enormous extent on the socialist community's stability, the successes of each country's creative activity, and the purposefulness and coordinated nature of their actions." Each week and each day that pass confirm anew the correctness of this stipulation. In their practical activity, the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government attach paramount significance to the questions of strengthening friendship to the utmost and improving ties with the fraternal community countries, of developing stable comradely relations and multifaceted cooperation between the USSR and all states of the world socialist system, and of consolidating our common positions in the international arena.

Reciprocal visits and businesslike contacts between leading figures from fraternal parties and governments, the exchange of experience in socialist building, and the joint review of problems of international life have become a sound tradition. This week P. Mladenov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and minister of foreign affairs of the Bulgarian People's Republic, was on an official friendly visit to our country at the invitation of the Soviet Government. Topical questions concerning the further deepening of mutual cooperation and problems of the present situation in the world were discussed during the Soviet-Bulgarian talks, which proceeded in an atmosphere of cordiality and total unity of views. The Soviet and Bulgarian sides emphasized again that the practical implementation of the accords reached in Geneva is one of the most important ways to improve the international situation. They declared their resolve to build up efforts aimed at the termination of the arms race and at real advancement toward disarmament. The USSR and the Bulgarian People's Republic fully support the initiatives to establish nuclear-free zones, including in the Balkans.

Actively, Purposefully

Loyal to Lenin's behests, the Soviet Union, together with the other socialist community countries, is actively and purposefully implementing a policy of struggle for peace, for termination of the arms race, and for disarmament. This consistent policy accords with the vital interests of the peoples and invariably encounters broad support.

Almost a month has already passed since the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. But its results still remain at the focus of attention by the entire world public. Even though there was no success in finding specific solutions on the limitation and reduction of armaments in the course of the Geneva dialogue, and even though differences on fundamental questions remain between the sides, it is now obvious to everyone that the meeting was necessary and useful. It confirmed yet again that cooperation between peoples and between states with different social systems and different ideologies is something fully possible and now, in the nuclear age, also something very necessary. Mankind has one large home -- the planet earth -- and people must be able to get on with one another on it, they must learn to respect each other and to preserve it for themselves and for the future generations through joint efforts.

Geneva marked the beginning of a discussion on explosive acute problems that have been building up over the years. But specific deeds are needed from both sides in order to progress further. The Soviet Union is ready for such practical steps which would help to smooth Soviet-U.S. relations. It is ready, in a spirit of honest interaction with the United States, to seek the curtailment of the arms race while preventing it in space, and to promote as far as possible the improvement of the political climate in the world. It is also ready for interaction on other questions, including the trade and economic sphere, provided, of course, that this takes place in line with the principles of mutual respect and complete equality without any discrimination whatever.

It is clear that the week which has passed provided additional convincing proof of the USSR's active and tireless foreign policy activity, aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war and at developing normal business relations between countries and peoples.

But the world remains unsettled. The aggressive circles of imperialism are trying to chill the warm post-Geneva winds and to freeze the incipient thaw. Egged on by the military-industrial complex, conservative politicians and Pentagon generals not only are in no hurry to abandon their plans for the militarization of space, but are also stubbornly stepping up preparations for the implementation of the "star wars" program. This causes serious anxiety and alarm among the peoples. No attempts by the U.S. Administration or tricks by U.S. propaganda, trying to present Washington's "strategic defense initiative" as a purely defensive program, can conceal the true objective of the Pentagon's bosses -- to create [sozdat] a new class of arms and secure U.S. military-strategic superiority over the USSR. It is not difficult to understand that the implementation of this program will lead to a hitherto unparalleled escalation of the arms race and will create a serious threat to peace on the planet.

Today's international situation is contradictory and not simple. But the main and determining trend is clearly visible -- the growing determination of the peoples to uphold and strengthen peace. The struggle for termination of the arms race and for disarmament goes on. It grows with each passing day, and this generates confidence and optimism. Soviet people, the working people in fraternal socialist countries, and all peoples in the world are approaching the new year with firm belief in the bright tomorrow.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1193

RELATED ISSUES

USSR WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE', 15 DECEMBER

LD151842 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 15 Dec 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio international commentator; with Vladimir Viktorovich Bolshakov, PRAVDA observer; and Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, TASS political observer]

Geneva Summit

[Excerpt] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! Almost a month has gone by since the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. With the passage of time, however, the range of this event is becoming more and more noticeable and tangible. Among other things this is indicated by the fact that the meeting itself and its results remain literally at the center of the attention of the major world press organs and of state, political and public figures in the United States, the countries of Western Europe, and other world countries. It would be more correct to say that a process of interpreting everything that was said and done in Geneva is now taking place, a process of reevaluating individual manifestations in international life. No one now has any doubts that the results of the Geneva meeting will have and are already having the most direct influence upon international affairs and mutual relations between states. We will talk about this a little later. And there is no doubt now that the Geneva dialogue was, if you like, a historic necessity, for the current stage in the development of international relations can rightly be called critical -- critical in the sense that mankind finds itself faced with a choice between survival and the threat of complete destruction.

The Geneva meeting, or more precisely its results, has created possibilities for changing over from a state of confrontation to a process of searching for ways leading toward the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations and mutual relations between other states. From our point of view, the policy is one of consistent, persistent striving to achieve the main objective, regardless of circumstances or periods which are sometimes unfavorable. It is a set of efforts, an ability to assess the arguments of the other side and to find a compromise solution which takes into account the interests of both sides and which is founded upon the principle of equality and identical security. The Geneva meeting is rightly looked upon as the beginning of a positive process. A few days ago, President Reagan used precisely these words beginning, because any beginning envisages that there will be a continuation. And by continuation we mean, in concrete terms, the implementation of the accords which were reached between the leaders of our two countries. I would like to quote from the speech Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbavhev made recently to U.S. businessmen in Moscow. He said: We have entered an exceedingly crucial period in which words, intentions and political statements must materialize in specific decisions and deeds. As you know, what we are talking about are decision and deeds which would encourage a smoothing-out of Soviet-U.S. relations and an overall improvement in the world political climate. After this brief introduction of mine, I would like to yield to one of the participants in our program, my old friend Vladimir Viktorovich Bolshakov, the PRAVDA observer. He reported the progress of the Geneva meeting as a special correspondent and contributed a whole series of analytical articles to the pages of PRAVDA.

[Bolshakov] It has to be said that the adherence to the "star wars" concept by President Reagan personally and the majority of his administration was the main obstacle at the Geneva meeting to the adoption of accords like those which the Soviet Union proposed and which were supported by many realistically-minded figures in the United States.

No matter what has been said overall about this concept, it has to be approached in a sober way. No matter how romantic the name that has been given to the program for creating strike armaments in space, it does not, of course, pursue the aim of creating some kind of defensive weapon. If it is a shield, then it is a shield from behind with which they can deliver a strike against the Soviet Union. There is no foundation for us to suppose that the space weapons being created by the United States will not be used to hit targets on earth, that there only exist plans for the defense of the United States against missiles. But these plans for providing defense against missiles of themselves, so to speak, intensify to a certain degree the nuclear missile potential of the United States. The calculation is being made on gaining the possibility of delivering a nuclear strike first against the Soviet Union -- this at first was not concealed by the apologists of "star wars" -- and of sitting things out themselves behind this shield, thereby either substantially reducing the counter-strike and its effects upon the territory of the United States and its strategic forces, or preventing such a counter-strike altogether.

Of course, as far as preventing it is concerned, that is not very realistic; even if it proves possible to reduce it there then arises the temptation to take what the Pentagon strategists call acceptable losses. And as you know, acceptable losses is reckoned in millions of human lives. But even this does not stop the Pentagon adventurists. This position of the United States was subjected to serious analysis on our part. President Reagan was told directly in Geneva that we cannot agree that this is supposedly a peaceful venture, that the Soviet Union will be compelled to take definite measures in order to find an equivalent response to the nuclear-missile space shield being created by the United States, and that we cannot in any event consider issues concerning the reduction of strategic armament in particular without having previously closed the door to the breakthrough of the arms race into open space. This Soviet position remained precise and one of principle from the very beginning to the end, and we continue to adhere to it now.

NATO Discussions

[Grigoryev] As far as "star wars" is concerned, it has to be said that this problem concerns not just the two great powers but other countries, too, and primarily those in Western Europe: for the U.S. Administration is making every effort to draw its European allies in NATO into the preparations for the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

In this connection, it is interesting to take a look at the veritable NATO marathon, the sessions of various NATO organs which this year have been lasting longer than ever before. Without any doubt, the main issue in all these NATO discussions has been the

Geneva talks: the problem of the SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, and the problem of making a 50 percent reduction in strategic armaments, a proposal which was made by our country. And it has to be said that by this last stage in the NATO marathon Washington had managed to achieve a situation in which one of its closest allies had said "yes" precisely, clearly and formally, even, on paper, to its own involvement in preparations for "star wars." This was Britain. Next in line is the FRG. It has not uttered its formal, official "yes" -- but it is virtually ready to do so. Ost, an official spokesman for the FRG Government, has stated that this "yes" will be said at a session of the Bonn cabinet next Thursday, 18 December. [as heard] There's no need to think that all of this -- whether in the FRG, which, I repeat, has almost said "yes," or in other NATO countries -- there's no need to think that all of this is taking place painlessly and easily.

While the leaders of the ruling coalition in the persons of Chancellor Kohl and Strauss, the chairman of the Baravian Christian Social Union Party, are giving a simple "yes" -- Kohl says that SDI is morally justified, Woerner, his defense minister, says that it is both morally justified and politically necessary -- and while Strauss is simply urging along the involvement of the FRG in the "star wars" program, saying that the Americans are very disappointed about the contradictory reaction on this topic on the banks of the Rhine; at the same time there are political figures, and some of them are in the ruling coalition, who in general are wavering: first and foremost there is one member of the ruling coalition with the Free Democratic Party.

Why, then, is the FRG apparently going to participate? We'll put it like that; it is apparently going to participate in this. There are three reasons here. There is above all the so-called Atlantic solidarity; and there is the aspiration of the Federal Republic to become equal with such nuclear powers as Great Britain and France, possessing their nuclear forces; but also -- and far from in the last place -- there are the interests of the military-industrial complex, which is, of course, attempting to participate in sharing out this gigantic and profitable pie. Such concerns as the Messerschmitt-Blokow-Blohm aircraft and missiles concern in Bavaria have already, so to speak, practically held out their hands in order to participate in this business. Naturally, on the other hand, many political figures, not to mention the FRG public, are aware that participation by Bonn in this program will inevitably influence East-West relations, and specifically relations between the Federal Republic and its East European socialist neighbors, But in the overall assessment I maintain that unfortunately the first consideration will evidently win here all the same.

[Bolshakov] I would still like to add to what was said about this Atlantic marathon. We are now observing a process that seems to me to be highly dangerous. The Soviet leadership noted in Geneva and then in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's address at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, that we hope that what the United States said about SDI in Geneva is not its last word, that we will still manage to find some kind of understanding. It has to be taken into account that on 16 January the Geneva talks on the whole complex of issues -- strategic weapons, nuclear means of intermediate range, and on nonmilitarization of space -- will be renewed. And in Geneva, both leaders confirmed their adherence to the agreement of January of this year, where it was set down that it is necessary to resolve all these issues as a single set. What, then, is taking place now, as more and more countries are being drawn into the implementation of the program of developing and testing of "star wars" technology? Well, the process of arms control, as they say in the West -- we use different terms, the process itself, so to say, the process of disarmament in its broad movement -- this will effectively be placed into increasingly more complex conditions. It will be very difficult to achieve accords if the door for the arms race in space is wide open. The results will be the same as what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev talked about in Paris. What is achieved in solving a number of issues when they are approached from the position of achieving some kind of advantage over the Soviet Union? As he said, they are hammering in the nails and tightening the screws and they then propose to pull them out with their teeth. Perhaps all the same in U.S. and NATO circles they will seriously think about what is now being done.

What for? For the sake of the wolf-like appetites of these military and industrial complexes, the will of the people is being ignored. And another revealing factor. Just take for instance this fact: In the United States in 1984, 54 percent of Americans questioned supported SDI.

They did not then understand, as they say, what it was, but following the opening of discussions in the United States in July of this year, only 43 percent of Americans were in favor. Before the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Geneva, even fewer of them were in favor. The support for "star wars" is falling in the United States as well as in Western Europe and in other countries of the world. It has to be said that a new psychological climate is now being established in Soviet-U.S. relations, that is, precisely the kind of climate in which it would be possible without any banalities, without propagandist cliches, without political invective against each other, to state one's own views on the most cardinal problems of the present time, the problem of peace and war. And I think that this new psychological climate is a very important factor in our relations with the United States. If the United States follows our example, our call for the preservation of all the good which was embodied in the Geneva accords, if they do not try to make artificial obstacles to it, then our world may truly become a far safer place than it is at present. And I think that the United States has an equal degree of interest in undertaking specific steps aimed at curbing the arms race and at not allowing its being spread into space, because it fully corresponds to the interests of their own security. And the Soviet Union is not at all interested in weakening U.S. security in any degree at all. We are in favor of the strategic parity which now exists, but at a much lower level.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1193

END

JPRS-TAC-86-005

10 January 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-005

10 January 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet Commentary on U.S. SDI Strategy in W. Europe
(Various sources, various dates) 1

PRAVDA Editorial Article 1
Attempts To Shift Costs, by Sergey Lebedev 3
FRG Next To Yield 5
WEU Debates, by Yu. Kovalenko 5
French Views on SDI Analyzed, by Vitaliy Andreyev 6
France's Quiles Criticizes SDI 8
'Dangerous Spiral' 8
FRG Bundestag Debates 9
FRG Poll Shows Opposition 10
German CP Statement 11
Mitterrand Reconfirms Opposition 11
UK Role Causes Criticism, by V. Ilyashenko 12
Social Democrat's Rau 12
FRG Foreign Minister Genscher 13

Soviets Criticize Weinberger Meeting With French Defense Minister
(Moscow TASS, 10 Dec 85) 14

USSR Criticizes Weinberger's Bonn Address
(Vladimir Bogachev; Moscow TASS International Service,
6 Dec 85) 15

PRAVDA: Pugwash Movement Participants Repudiate SDI
(Moscow PRAVDA, 11 Dec 85) 17

TASS Observer Accuses Regan of 'Distorting Facts'
(Moscow TASS International Service, 25 Nov 85) 18

TASS: UN Debate on Space Use Causes U.S. 'Irritation'
(Moscow TASS, 27 Nov 85) 20

TASS: 'Heated Debates' on SDI Continue in U.S.
(Moscow TASS, 11 Dec 85) 22

USSR's Velikhov Rejects U.S. Claims on Soviet 'SDI'
(Yevgeniy Velikhov Interview; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, 1 Dec 85) 25

TASS: U.S. Speeds Up Weapons Testing Under SDI Program
(Moscow TASS, 17 Dec 85) 27

USSR: U.S. Groups Try To Make SDI Progress 'Irreversible'
(Aleksandr Mozgovoy; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Dec 85) 28

TASS: Gardner Remarks Confirm SDI Aim of Superiority
(Moscow TASS, 13 Dec 85) 30

TASS Cites Former U.S. Officials' Opposition to SDI
(Moscow TASS, 11 Nov 85) 31

PRAVDA: Academician Hails U.S. Scientists' Anti-SDI Stance
(R. Sagdeyev; Moscow PRAVDA, 2 Nov 85) 32

USSR's Bogachev on Need To Extend 'Common Ground'
(Moscow TASS International Service, 10 Dec 85) 34

TASS: Strategic Parity 'Essential' to World Security
(Moscow TASS, 13 Dec 85) 36

USSR: U.S. Increasing Pressure on Japan To Join SDI
(Various sources, 12 Dec 85) 38

TASS Report 38
'Threatening To Create Difficulties', by Valeriy Korzin 38

Moscow TV: U.S. Papers, Public Oppose 'Star Wars'
(Valeriy Korzin; Moscow Television Service, 5 Nov 85) ... 40

Moscow TV: SDI 'Champions' Acting 'More Vigorously' After Geneva
(Farid Seyful-Mulyukov; Moscow Television Service, 2 Dec 85) 42

Soviet Academician Denies SDI Benefits Economy
(Aleksey Vasilyev; Madrid EL PAIS, 7 Dec 85) 43

Briefs
TASS on Lockheed Contract 45
PRAVDA on U.S. 'Compact' Reactor 45
TASS on U.S. X-Ray Laser Research 45
TASS: U.S. Experts Disagree 46
TASS on U.S. Experts' 'Concern' 46
TASS on Reagan Interview 46
TASS on French Conference 47
Moscow Notes U.S. Test 47

RELATED ISSUES

IZVESTIYA Criticizes U.S. Votes on UN Arms Resolutions
(V. Soldatov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 22 Dec 85) 48

TASS Reviews 40th UN General Assembly Session
(Moscow TASS, 18 Dec 85) 50

USSR's UN Delegates View UNGA 40th Session
(Various sources, various dates) 52

'Favorable' Results 52
USSR Ambassador 52
USSR's Petrovskiy 53

USSR's Lt Gen Volkogonov Comments on Potential for War, Peace
(Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov; Moscow Domestic Service, 21 Dec 85) 55

PRAVDA 22 December Review of Week's International Events
(Tomas Kolensichenko; Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Dec 85) 57

USSR 20 December 'International Situation: Questions and Answers'
(Sergey Pravdin, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 20 Dec 85) 61

International Relations 61
Nuclear Test Moratorium 61

USSR 22 December 'International Observers Roundtable'
(Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 22 Dec 85) 63

Geneva Summit 63
Nuclear Test Moratorium 64
Results of Geneva 65
East-West Dialogue 67

Moscow Reports Antiwar Group Cochairmen News Conference
(Yevgeniy Chazov, Biryukov; Moscow Television Service, 19 Dec 85) 68

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON U.S. SDI STRATEGY IN W. EUROPE

PRAVDA Editorial Article

PM111626 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "Responsible Approach Needed"]

[Text] The summit meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders encountered the broadest response throughout the world, and that is no accident. It was looked forward to with impatience, tremendous interest was shown in it, and people in all corners of our planet pinned hopes on it.

At the present critical stage, in international relations, under conditions in which mankind is faced with a choice between survival and the threat of destruction, the Soviet-U.S. meeting was necessary and useful. And, although no specific, practical decisions were reached during the discussions between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan on limiting and reducing armaments, the international public is talking about the undoubted positive significance of the exchange of opinions that took place. The importance of the beginning of USSR-U.S. dialogue, under conditions in which the international situation had exacerbated in recent years, is pointed out. The fact is highlighted that the sides agreed to accelerate the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms. The talks are confronted with the task, defined in the 8 January 1985 Soviet-U.S. statement, of preventing an arms race in space and curbing it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and strengthening strategic stability.

The positive appraisals of the summit meeting are shared in West European capitals, particularly London and Bonn. British Prime Minister Thatcher observed that the meeting had been highly constructive and constituted a good basis for building relations of mutual confidence in the future. Expressing satisfaction with its outcome, the British Government head even talked about "warm support" for the results achieved. The FRG Government also points to the opportunity opened up as a result of the M.S. Gorbachev-R. Reagan conversations for a new stage in relations between West and East and declares the need for West Europe to make its own, active contribution to the development of those relations. Both London and Bonn express the hope that the Geneva summit will give impetus to the talks on nuclear and space arms and strengthen the regime of existing arms limitation and control agreements.

These are sober, sensible assessments, but they also involve commitments. At least it requires a commitment that no actions be taken that would be capable of creating obstacles to negotiations which, by mutual agreement, it has been decided to accelerate. It also requires a commitment that those existing dampers on the arms race which are an important basis for strategic stability in the world should not be eroded. Here the words of the governments of the FRG and Britain are patently at odds with their deeds.

It is, after all, well-known where the reason lies for the fact that, so far, progress has not been achieved at the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms. It lies in the stance of the United States which is reluctant to reach agreement on a prohibition on space strike armaments and is seeking to legalize the "star wars" program.

This basic obstruction was pointed out in the report of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the recent USSR Supreme Soviet session. As was noted in the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the Results of the Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting in Geneva and the International Situation," keeping space free of weapons is of decisive significance for achieving agreements on radical reductions of nuclear weapons. Anyone who wants to understand the package of questions on nuclear and space armaments cannot fail to realize that each new step along the path of implementing the SDI program creates additional obstacles to finding compromise solutions and damages the unlimited Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty.

The activeness that the FRG and British Governments have been displaying in recent weeks in involving their countries in the U.S. programs for creating [sozdaniye] space strike arms is perplexing, to put it mildly, in light of this. A few days ago, a memorandum about this was signed by the British and U.S. defense secretaries. Bonn too is hurrying to draw up appropriate accords with the Pentagon; if possible, even before the Christmas holidays. In the process, the SDI program is being declared as "morally justified," "politically necessary," and consonant with "the interests of the West as a whole." In order to reassure the public, it is being claimed that it is a question of nothing more than participation in "research" work. At the same time the involvement of the FRG and Britain in the plans for the militarization of space is being portrayed virtually as a contribution to progress at the Geneva talks. The completion of the SDI program, it is claimed, will make it possible to pressure the Soviet Union and will strengthen the positions of the United States and NATO. Moreover, FRG Defense Minister Woerner is calling on the Western European NATO countries to supplement the U.S. program for the militarization of space with a program of their own for creating [sozdaniye] a ground- and space-based ABM system.

The attempt to use the "space shield" as a cover for acquiring the capacity to deliver a first nuclear strike has nothing in common with morality. It is by no means a question of the development [razrabotka] of some kind of innocent defensive facilities. An analysis of the SDI program shows that its point is to create an additional element in the U.S. offensive potential. The consequence of the appearance of space strike arms can only be a destabilization of the strategic situation, an intensification of the arms race in all directions, and a sharp reduction in security for all, including the United States and its allies.

It is clear that the continuation of preparations for "star wars" would seriously undermine the chances of achieving weighty results at the Geneva talks, and would by no means lead to an acceleration of them. It is also evident that the conclusion of agreements between the United States and third states on participation in the creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements is incompatible with the provisions of the ABM Treaty and with its aims and principles.

The militarization of space will not bring anyone either military or political advantages. It objectively accords with no one's interests.

Incidentally, this is understood in many countries, including countries which are U.S. allies. For this reason, the governments of such countries as Denmark, Norway, Greece, the Netherlands, Canada, and Australia have refused to participate in SDI. It is indicative that France has rejected the line aimed at militarizing space. In President Mitterrand's assessment, "the shifting of nuclear arms into space would mean not only the end of the ABM Treaty but also the transition to a new spiral of the arms race."

The question which arises under these conditions is the objectives being pursued by the British and FRG Governments in agreeing to participate in the SDI program. If they are really interested in the success of the talks on preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth why make efforts whose inevitable consequence would be the proliferation of the arms race to a new sphere--outer space? Willy-nilly the position now being adopted by the British and FRG Governments objectively plays into the hands of those circles in the United States that have no intention of seeking agreement on anything.

Those who take the decisions in Britain and the FRG still have time to carefully ponder and weigh all the consequences which their countries' practical participation in the United States' space adventure would entail. A feature of the present situation, M.S. Gorbachev has noted, is the growing responsibility of statesmen and politicians for the fate of peace. Awareness of this responsibility must nourish states' policies and their governments' actions. It is hoped that a realistic approach in keeping with the demands of the times and the interests of mutual understanding among states and the strengthening of the peoples' security will nevertheless triumph in both Bonn and London. Access to space must be closed for weapons.

Attempts To Shift Costs

LD110438 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Sergey Lebedev commentary]

[Text] Another "Jane's" world encyclopedia of military aircraft was published in London almost at the same time as Britain signed an agreement on participation in the American "star wars" program. "Jane's" Editor in Chief John Taylor has called President Reagan's Strategic [Defense] Initiative a dubious and expensive gamble. By launching the Strategic Defense Initiative, he said, the president committed the United States to expenditure so immense and unpredictable that all estimates tended to be meaningless. Such an admission of a world-famous and competent organization that cooperates with top experts, scientists, and military men from many countries is notable for those who face the alternative: to join the dangerous gamble or not. The Thatcher government shifted part of the American burden onto the shoulders of its country by signing the agreement; and this approach meets the interests of the Reagan administration best of all, because the spending involved in "star wars" horrifies many Americans. The White House wants to calm their worries by separate deals with West European countries. Suffice it to say that this year the United States Administration has assigned $2.7 billion to the project, and next year General Abrahamsom, who heads the program, intends to ask for $4.9 billion.

The agreement signed in London by Weinberger and Heseltine shows that the United States doesn't promise anything to its contractors in Europe. Washington has again refused to promise British companies concrete sums and only outlined the general spheres of development in which British companies will be involved. This leaves the Pentagon the right to keep the most profitable orders for American monopolies and fan competition among West European participants in the Strategic Defense Initiative, if other countries follow Britain.

Getting back to "Jane's" encyclopedia, we would like to single out one more provision. The book says estimates (?that) for $60 billion Americans might get a system 90 percent effective against a Soviet ballistic missiles attack sound encouraging until one thinks of the remaining 10 percent of the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear warheads falling on United States territory.

It is notable that the opinion of the world's leading experts fully coincides with what the French defense minister, Quiles, said about the Strategic Defense Initiative a few days ago. He confirmed the negative attitude of his country to the American "star wars" program and called it very dangerous. He said on the First Channel of French Television the United States claimed that the space shield would remove the nuclear threat, while he was convinced that it would inevitably increase the risk of war. The program stands for the deployment over the planet of 400-500 observer and interceptor satellites equipped with laser weapons. It is said that such a shield would prevent Soviet nuclear charges from reaching American territory, but even if it is 90 percent effective, the French minister said, the United States would still be fully destroyed.

After such evaluations, the promises of Americans to cover Western Europe with a space umbrella look even less feasible. Apparently the slogan of the Pentagon on the issue will be: The rescue of the drowning is the concern of the drowning themselves. In any case, having signed the agreement with Washington rendered doubtful services to the security of the United Kingdom.

There is a proverb in England saying that one can't run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. The declarations of the Tory government of its wish to see the fruits of an East-West dialogue and simultaneously participate in large-scale arms buildup programs are just as impossible.

FRG Next To Yield

LD120948 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 11 Dec 85

[Excerpts] According to the West German newspaper DIE WELT the FRG Government next week plans to make a decision on West Germany's participation in the so-called U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative research program.

It is not a secret, notes Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political observer, that the United States, having made a stake on force in its foreign policy, for a long time now has been trying to draw West European NATO allies into preparations for so-called "star wars."

The first to yield to this pressure a few days ago was Britain, and as the London GUARDIAN newspaper stressed, Washington has clearly conceived the idea of using London's consent for putting pressure on other NATO partners. Next in turn is West Germany. Commenting on Bonn's position in this matter, observers are noting that FRG ruling circles and West German military monopolies, acting under Washington's patronage, are for their part, also striving to link themselves with the production of super-new space weaponry. Moreover, statements are being made openly about this in Bonn.

Wide sections of the population in the FRG, however, are coming out decisively against participation in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, which pursues the aim of creating for lovers of military adventures, under the cover of the so-called cosmic shield, the opportunity for an unpunished nuclear strike on countries of socialism.

Reflecting the mood of the FRG public, prominent West German scientists, including Schneider, Fischer, and other experts who took part in hearings which have just ended in the Bundestag, stressed that the implementation of the so-called U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, can only undermine the basis for talks on disarmament, lead to a new round in the arms race, and create a threat to the cause of peace.

WEU Debates

PM091223 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch under the "Topic of the Day" rubric: "Western European Union: Debates Over"]

[Text] Paris—The session of the Assembly of the Western European Union [WEU]—the military-political grouping comprising Belgium, Britain, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, France, and the FRG--has finished its work here.

The parliamentarians of the seven West European countries devoted their main attention to questions concerning their attitude to the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). For several sessions now the WEU states have tried unsuccessfully to draft a unified response to Washington's proposal that they involve themselves in the "star wars" preparation plans. This time too they failed to reach agreement. A number of countries, under Transatlantic pressure, were inclined to participate in SDI, but others were against.

French External Relations Minister R. Dumas reaffirmed Paris' refusal to participate in the U.S. "star wars" preparation plans. A number of participants in the session sharply criticized the U.S. "star wars" program.

The WEU Assembly also examined questions concerned with activating the military-political grouping, which the documents simply describe as the "European buttress of the NATO." What is involved in point of fact is the knocking together of a "European defense community" based on the WEU with the gradual involvement in it of all Common Market members. The session participants recommended that three new special agencies on defense and arms questions be set up within the WEU.

The session participants stressed the significance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the mutual understanding reached there that nuclear war must never be launched and that it cannot be won. French External Relations Minister R. Dumas welcomed the restoration of dialogue between the USSR and U.S. leaders and expressed the hope that the Geneva meeting was the beginning of an improvement in the international climate. The recent Soviet-French talks in Paris, the minister pointed out, had also helped in this. At the same time the majority of participants in the session advocated building up the West's military might and close cooperation within NATO.

The results of the WEU Assembly session show that it is the forces intent on strengthening "NATO's European buttress" and working toward the creation of a "European defense community" which are setting the tone for the military-political grouping. Nevertheless Washington has not yet succeeded in securing unconditional support from all its allies or obtaining their participation in SDI. The arm-twisting continues.

French Views on SDI Analyzed

LD161102 Moscow International Service in French 1830 GMT 14 Dec 85

[Station observer Vitaliy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] In his recent address on television, French Defense Minister Paul Quiles criticized the U.S. so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI], commonly known as the "star wars" program. Expressing governmental views, he underlined the danger of attempts to present SDI as a kind of space shield meant to eliminate nuclear danger. President Mitterrand and other French statesmen have the same idea. In fact, the "star wars" concept, writes our observer Vitaliy Andreyev creates a fresh danger of conflict which is extremely serious.

This realistic view is shared by numerous sensible political figures in France and by eminent military experts. Thus, Paul-Marie (de la Gorse), illustrious French specialist in military strategy problems, has qualified the White House plans as a destabilization program that undermines the foundations of national security. General Gallois, to whom anti-Americanism cannot be attributed, is of the same opinion.

The militarization of space is being energetically fought by the French Communist Party which estimates that deployment of weapons in space would cause a further deterioration of stability and compromise the possibility of controlling arms. The French Socialist Party and numerous public organizations, as well as veterans' associations are also against the siting of space strike weapons. The number of opponents of "star wars" is rising in France, but there exist forces that obviously play into the hands of Washington. Among the advocates of "star wars" one notes particularly Mr Jacques Chirac, mayor of Paris and leader of the RPR [Rally for the Republic], a right-wing party. In pleading the cause of Atlantic solidarity, he supports SDI; but whose interests is the mayor of Paris promoting--the mayor who misses no opportunity to stress his attachment to an independent policy for France?

The UDF [Union for French Democracy] personalities, foremost the leader of this party's parliamentary group, Jean Gaudin, speaks along the same lines. What they say contradicts [French] national interests. France's association with the U.S. "star wars" program would put a question mark over its independence and its security. Alignment with Washington, which seeks its own interests, has never benefited France. Its great power status can be defended only when France speaks with its own voice in the international arena, especially on a question as important as space.

Ever wider circles of the French public today think that there is no more important task than blocking the spread of nuclear weapons into space. The USSR poses the question in this way too. It was the theme of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva. It is also the objective of all the initiatives of the USSR concerning arms control. But the United States is still banking on "star wars." Washington obviously seeks military supremacy. However, the implementation of its programs would make any arrangement on nuclear arms reduction impossible, and would endanger the complex of talks on disarmament.

The Soviet Union and France, these two superpowers, can contribute to protecting space against weapons. The Soviet-French summit in Paris has revealed the existence of points of convergence in this area. The USSR and France have an interest in [ensuring] that space remains free of any weapons. Moscow and Paris are contributing to the peaceful exploration of space. This is demonstrated by the Soviet-French joint space mission in 1982, and the exploration of Venus through the Vega program. These examples prove that space must not serve extermination and war, but the interests of science and peace, concludes our observer Vitaliy Andreyev.

France's Quiles Criticizes SDI

LD172114 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 17 Dec 85

[Text] Paris, December 17 TASS--French Defence Minister Paul Quiles has criticized the American programme for the creation of outer space weapons. Speaking in an interview with the French newspaper LE MONDE, he stressed, in particular, that the "Strategic Defence Initiative" of the USA providing for the deployment of outer space weapons does not instill trust. Paul Quiles pointed out that a number of experts of the French Defence Ministry consider the American programme to be "unrealistic and dangerous".

Touching upon France's stand on the SDI, the defence minister pointed out that the American programme may only whip up the arms race. He stressed that the French Government favours a peaceful exploration of outer space.

'Dangerous Spiral'

LD132313 Moscow TASS in English 2258 GMT 13 Dec 85

["Star Wars and Illusions of Militarists"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 13 TASS--By TASS commentator Petr Parkhitko:

During today's [13 December] Bundestag debate on the U.S. "Strategic Defence Initiative" and the possible involvement in it of West Germany, West German Defence Minister Manfred Woerner acted once again as the chief advocate of the "star wars" plans.

According to the head of the West German military department, SDI is a "justified and politically necessary step" which "meets the interests of strengthening the West's security in general and the security of the Federal Republic of Germany in particular," DPA News Agency quoted him as saying. The Bonn minister called for a positive reply to the White House on West German participation in the SDI effort.

The activity of the Bonn defence minister in selling SDI and the desire to sweep West Germany into the orbit of "star wars" contrary to the will of an overwhelming majority of West Germans are explained not only by the militarist ambitions of the "hawks" from the banks of the Rhine and the striving to capitalize on military orders the West German military-industrial complex hopes to receive on joining SDI.

Once the agreement with the United States is concluded, West Germany will get access to the production and qualitatively new types of armaments the aim of which is, in the long run, to achieve military superiority over the East. This is the very objective which the militarists on the two sides of the Atlantic are seeking to attain.

They seek to attain this objective despite the fact that, as acknowledged by prominent experts in the United States, such as Lt.-Gen. James Abrahamson, director of the Strategic Defence Initiative Organization, a "space shield" will have holes and may generate a false sense of security...

The advocates of the "star wars" concept should better take into account that the USSR, as repeatedly stressed by the Soviet leadership, will not allow the West to gain military superiority either on earth, or in outer space.

This means that the implementation of the SDI programme and the involvement of U.S. Western European NATO allies in the dangerous "star wars" plans will create a qualitatively new and far more dangerous spiral in the arms race, will further complicate East-West relations and the world situation on the whole.

FRG Bundestag Debates

LD142319 Moscow TASS in English 2307 GMT 14 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, December 14 TASS--TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy reports:

A debate on the question of the FRG's attitude towards the U.S. "star wars" plans has been held in the Bundestag. Two draft resolutions which were introduced by the Social Democratic Party (SPD) group served as the basis for the debate. In one of the draft resolutions the SPD demanded that Bonn renounce the conclusion of an intergovernmental agreement with the United States on the FRG's participation in the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) and cautioned it against entering any talks with the USA on this question. The draft resolution points out that the signing of such an agreement should be viewed as a fact of Bonn's political support for the SDI programme. Political damage from the conclusion of such an agreement with the USA will be in no way compensated by a possible commercial benefit derived by the FRG's firms from their participation in research within the SDI framework.

The other draft resolution cautions the Government of the FRG against participating in the so-called "European Defence Initiative" (EDI)--a "European version" of the U.S. "star wars" programme. To achieve concrete accords on disarmament and arms control is an urgent necessity, the SPD's draft resolution stresses.

The debate was preceded by two-day public hearings on these questions in the Bundestag. Most speakers--prominent scientists and experts--declared against Bonn's being drawn into the realisation of the U.S. "star wars" plans. Bonn's any participation in the U.S. space militarization programme is also being rejected by a majority of the FRG's population, which has been evidenced once again by a public opinion poll taken by the ZDF TV network recently.

However, the cabinet of Chancellor Helmut Kohl, toeing Washington's line, is insisting on the FRG's participation in the SDI as well as is advocating supplementing the militarist programme with the "European version"--EDI.

Today's speech made in the Bundestag by Manfred Woerner, the FRG's minister of defence, in point of fact came to extolling "star wars" and to echoing the Pentagon's propaganda "arguments" in favour of Bonn's participation in the space militarization programme. Alfred Dregger, chairman of the CDU-CSU group, also appeared in the role of an advocate of the SDI.

Horst Ehmke, deputy chairman of the SPD group, condemned such a stand of the right-wing conservative government as making for an intensification of the arms race. The assertions of the Government of the FRG that it ostensibly strives for "a world with the least number of weapons" are no more than a screen which covers the arms build-up, he said. Ehmke accused the government of trying to please the military-industrial complex and the ultra-rightist politicians the type of Franz-Josef Strauss and thereby of acting at variance with the interests of the population of the FRG. The SDI programme, he emphasized, "is threatening to result in a new gigantic spiral of the arms race, the arena of which will be outer space." Deputies of the Greens Party also declared categorically against Bonn's participation in the SDI and EDI.

FRG Poll Shows Opposition

LD121416 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 12 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 12 TASS—TASS commentator Peter Parkhitko writes:

Three-fourths of West German voters oppose the "Strategic Defence Initiative" and West German participation in the U.S. "star wars" programme. This was revealed in the latest public poll's survey conducted by the administration of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

The survey also showed that the overwhelming majority of West German people did not support the course of the country's coalition government aimed at following the White House lead in politics.

This survey reflects reality of today when questions of war, peace and survival form the focus of the world politics. People of the world, including most West Germans, understand that the main task today is to stop the arms race, to find the way to general and complete disarmament and to improve the international situation. The U.S. "star wars" programme is incompatible with the solution of these universal security tasks. Andrey Gromyko, president of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, and a group of West German MPs noted during their recent meeting in Moscow that the "star wars" in its essence doomed the people of the world to live in conditions of accelerated military build-up and growing international tensions for years ahead.

The "star wars" implications could knock the basis out of solution to the arms limitation, arms reduction and disarmament problems.

This obvious truth underlies the concern of West German people when the Bonn government try to bring it to them that the West German participation in the SDI is not only a wishful but politically necessary step. If West Germany joined the United States military space plans, it would inevitably become the U.S. accomplice in creating a new class of weapons enabling the United States to deliver the first nuclear strike from under its space "shield."

The deployment of "Pershing-II" missiles and storage of other types of American mass destruction weapons, Pentagon's plans to bring a new generation of binary weapons to West Germany and, finally, the White House attempts to pressure it into joining the SDI make millions of West Germans to raise more active voices for peace against the plans of overseas militarists and their supporters in Bonn.

German CP Statement

LD141615 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 14 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, December 14 TASS--The support for the U.S. "star wars" plans expressed by the Bonn ruling coalition during the debate in Bundestag urgently requires that all the peace champions in West Germany step up the struggle against the threat of the militarization of outer space, against any participation of Bonn in Washington's space venture, says a statement of the board of the German Communist Party published here today. The debate has shown that the right-wing conservative coalition is ignoring the demands of the millions of citizens of the country and the warnings of prominent scientists on the need for West Germany to turn down the participation on the implementation of the SDI program. On the contrary, Bonn, unlike other NATO member states, is going to support at all costs those circles in the U.S. which are undermining mutual understanding among nations and are willing to extend the disastrous arms race into outer space. Actions of the advocates of the U.S. SDI program run counter to the vital interests of West Germany and its residents, the statement of the board of the German Communist Party stresses.

At the same time, the board of the German Communist Party welcomed the stand of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the Greens Party which demanded that Bonn give up any support for and participation in the U.S. "star wars" plans.

Mitterrand Reconfirms Opposition

LD160614 Moscow TASS in English 0554 GMT 16 Dec 85

[Text] Paris, December 16 TASS--President Francois Mitterrand of France has again confirmed that the French Government does not intend to participate in the space weapons development program which has been put forward by the U.S. Administration. Speaking in broadcast of the French "TF-1" TV network, the president pointed out, in particular, that the USA, upon having outlined the program, had actually invited France to participate in it as a kind of subcontractor. Francois Mitterrand stressed that he is against France's being drawn into such space military program which will lead only to an aggravation of international tension.

UK Role Causes Criticism

LD152246 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; V. Ilyashenko video report]

[Text] Just 1 week has passed since the signing of an agreement on the participation of Britain in the U.S. "star wars" program. The British have still not managed to come to their senses after this blow to their hopes for disarmament and detente which arose after Geneva.

The British military department has displayed enviable efficiency, already creating a special section which is to coordinate the work of British companies and laboratories developing space weapons. [Video shows Heseltine and Weinberger signing and exchanging documents; London street scenes; Whitehall; British Aerospace employees at work on printouts; scientist working with oscilloscope, cutting to Ilyashenko in street in Whitehall.]

The Conservative government has again demonstrated that it obediently follows in the wake of U.S. policy. Yesterday it was the decision on withdrawal from UNESCO, today it is joining the U.S. "star wars" program. It is not surprising that the leader of the Labor Party, Kinnock, has said that Thatcher is behaving not as prime minister of Great Britain, but more like the governor of the 51st state of the United States. [Video shows Thatcher shaking hands with Weinberger, then simulations of antimissile defense system.]

The British military-industrial monopoly is satisfied. And more U.S. orders promise British Aerospace, Marconi and Plessey, which produce radar, laser and electronic equipment, immense profits. They are not at all troubled by the fact that Britain is becoming an immediate accomplice to the dangerous program for the militarization of space. The British-U.S. agreement has given rise to acute criticism from the British public.

[Interview with Beresford, general secretary of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; in English fading into Russian translation.] The agreement, and the haste with which it was signed, sent many British people into shock, says Beresford. It was signed behind the backs of the British people. We emphatically oppose the plans for developing space weapons. They violate the Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic nuclear weapons and are leading to a new, unprecedented arms race and moving it into a new sphere--into space. All this gives rise to great apprehension in us. We are told that it is only research, but we are well aware that research inevitably leads to production of new weapons.

Social Democrat's Rau

LD162220 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 16 Dec 85

[Text] Ahlen, December 16 TASS--The Social Democratic Party of Germany held a conference in the West German city of Ahlen today. It examined this country's political, economic and social development and the foreign policies of its government.

"The Social Democrats," Johannes Rau, prime minister of North Rhine-Westphalia and deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, said at the conference, "positively assess the results of the Geneva meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, which has ushered in a new stage in Soviet-U.S. relations."

He said his party "intends to step up efforts against the arms race and prevent it from spreading to outer space."

FRG Foreign Minister Genscher

LD161731 Moscow TASS in English 2024 GMT 15 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, December 15 TASS--FRG Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher has warned against the dangerous character of the American "star wars" plans. In an interview to the SUDWESTFUNK radio station on the eve of the next week's meeting of the Bonn cabinet which is to discuss the FRG's participation in these plans, Hans Dietrich Genscher has said that military and political consequences of the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative should be considered above all in discussing it. It is necessary to take into account what influence this programme will exert on European security and disarmament negotiations, he stressed.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

WEINBERGER MEETING WITH FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER CRITICIZED BY SOVIETS

LD102300 Moscow TASS in English 1801 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, December 10 TASS--Talks have been held here between Caspar Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defence, and Paul Quiles, France's defence minister, who arrived on a visit in Washington. This is his first visit to the United States since his appointment as defence minister in September.

Officially, as a spokesman for the administration said, the French minister's visit and his talks with Weinberger are in the character of familiarization and not aimed at "concluding any agreements". Yet, as follows from the statement by that official, the administration is using the visit for intensifying cooperation with France in the military field. Thus Weinberger and Quiles "have exchanged views" on a broad range of military issues, including those concerning the conclusion of a contract with a French company for the production and supply of communication equipment for the U.S. Army and creation of a new fighter aircraft by France.

But main attention at the meeting, a spokesman for the administration said, was devoted to a discussion of President Reagan's "Strategic Defence Initiative". Thus in particular, the U.S. secretary of defence has explained to his colleague why President Reagan attaches so much significance to that programme.

France is known to have officially refused to participate in the "star wars" programme directed at militarizing outer space. Yet Washington clearly does not lose hope to draw Paris into the implementation of its dangerous designs. The American press stresses in that connection the fact that at his talks with the French defence minister, Caspar Weinberger specially touched upon the agreement reached with Britain last week on the participation of that country's companies in the effort to implement that Strategic Defence Initiative.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

USSR CRITICIZES WEINBERGER'S BONN ADDRESS

LD062306 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1450 GMT 6 Dec 85

["Ultra-Right-Wingers Oppose Constructive Dialogue"--TASS headline; by TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Dec (TASS)--U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger asserts that peace can only be ensured by deploying U.S. strike weapons in outer space and building up the U.S. nuclear force on earth. Addressing a U.S.-West German seminar in Bonn, the Pentagon chief employed far-fetched "arguments" in support of the "star wars" project by declaring, specifically, that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" alone can prevent war which the potential aggressor is preparing to unleash. Weinberger called on the U.S. allies to take part in the establishment of any antimissile defense, while simultaneously strengthening the nuclear deterrent.

It seems the Bonn seminar was yet another attempt by the ultra-right forces in the West to destroy all positive accomplishments made during the Soviet-U.S. summit and rule out the chance of continuing the dialogue with a view to achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations and in world affairs in general.

In complementing and developing the reckless ideas of his senior partner about "ways to ensure peace" through the arms race, West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner actually rejected at the seminar the very idea of talking with the Soviet Union on problems of arms reductions. He said it is necessary to abandon the attempts to link the questions of peace chiefly with cuts in armaments.

Weinberger himself does not regard the chief result of the summit meeting to have been the fact that in Geneva the sides stressed the importance of averting any kind of war between the USSR and the United States--either nuclear or conventional--but that the Soviet Union, as he put it, realized the "U.S. determination to adhere to the 'Strategic Defense Initiative.'"

There are political forces still at work in the West that clearly have no liking for the very prospect of a normalization of relations with the socialist countries or for the opportunity to curb the nuclear arms race and avert the militarization of space.

For all the statements of NATO "hawks," there are no contradictions that fatally doom the USSR and the United States to confrontation, let alone to war. And this was demonstrated by the very course of the November summit meeting. The peoples of the world have a right to hope that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue that began in Geneva will be continued in a constructive spirit and will lead to positive results--to a change in the political and psychological climate in contemporary international relations and to a diminution of the threat of nuclear war.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: PUGWASH MOVEMENT PARTICIPANTS REPUDIATE SDI

PM111051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general headline "Space Is Not for Wars!"]

[Text] London, 10 Dec--An international symposium of the Pugwash Movement has ended here with the adoption of a statement which resolutely condemns the U.S. plans for the preparation of "star wars."

Prominent scientists and specialists from a number of West European countries and also from the USSR and the United States took part in the discussion of its chief topic "War or Peace in Space."

After examining the political and military consequences of the U.S. so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," the document points out, the symposium participants came to the unanimous opinion that the "star wars" program would entail an unprecedented escalation of the arms race and seriously jeopardize peace on the planet. The implementation of this program, the statement stresses, "would promote a sharp escalation of an unlimited race in offensive and defensive weapons, break all existing agreements on arms control questions, increase the likelihood of nuclear war, and lead to the criminal dissipation of the scientific-technical and economic resources of a large part of the industrially developed world." In the opinion of the document's compilers, the Soviet-American ABM Treaty is primarily under attack.

The representatives of scientific opinion advocated observance of the Soviet-American ABM Treaty provisions, the substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals, and the prohibition of further testing and deployment of anti-satellite weapons. The best way to reduce the danger of nuclear war is to establish arms control, which will avert the possibility of creating new weapon systems and eliminate the need for huge expenditure on producing them, the statement says.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

TASS OBSERVER ACCUSES REGAN OF 'DISTORTING FACTS'

LD251836 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1548 GMT 25 Nov 85

["Regan Distorting the Facts"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Nov (TASS)--Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on political issues, writes:

Certain officials in Washington are attempting to distort the Soviet Union's position regarding the U.S. "star wars" plan, endeavoring to convince world public opinion that during the Geneva summit meeting the Soviet side somehow agreed to the prospect of space militarization by the United States.

Speaking on the U.S. CBS television program "Face the Nation," Donald Regan, head of the White House staff, maintained that the Soviet Union had allegedly "reconciled itself" to the creation of a large-scale, space-based antimissile defense system in the United States and that the Soviet Union was ready "to carry out this program as long as we (the United States) are also carrying out such a program."

Regan tried to refute the conclusion by specialists about the senselessness of limiting weapons systems on the comparatively limited area of the earth's surface if, at the same time, barriers to launching the arms race over the unlimited areas of space are eliminated. On this he gave the impression that the siting of U.S. strike weapons in near-earth space would not have a negative effect on the progress of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear weapons, since allegedly the United States is "striving for parity."

The head of the White House staff was reminded that at the press conference in Geneva the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev sharply criticized the U.S. "star wars" program and therefore, Regan's conclusions about a change of position by the USSR as regards the militarization of space sound unconvincing. But he preferred to evade such a formulation stating that here, you see, it is a question only of the fact that the Soviet Union "does not like" the U.S. SDI program.

Nonetheless, at the press conference after the summit meeting Mikhail Gorbachev quite unambiguously confirmed the USSR's principled position on the question of the nonmilitarization of space. He stated, in part: "If the door was open for weapons in space, then the dimensions of military rivalry would grow immeasurably, and the arms race would take on--this can already be predicted to a certain extent--an irreversible character, and it would run out of control...who can give a guarantee that we would then at all be able to organize any kind of productive talks? I think no sensible person could...the "star wars" program will not only provide an impetus for all types of weapons, but will also put an end to any restraint on the race."

Attempts by official representatives of Washington within merely a few days of the signing in Geneva of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement to carry out a revision of the sides' obligations laid down in it "to avert an arms race in space and curb it on earth" evoke surprise. Attempts to distort the USSR's position on problems of the nonmilitarization of space are incompatible with the spirit of the top level meetings in Geneva which have taken place.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

TASS: UN DEBATE ON SPACE USE CAUSES U.S. 'IRRITATION'

LD271022 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 27 Nov 85

[Text] New York, November 27 TASS--By TASS correspondent V. Chernyshev.

A debate at the special Political Committee of the U.N. General Assembly has reflected practically universal support for the Soviet initiative on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarization. The committee discussed the priority item of its agenda--international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

Representatives of socialist, non-aligned, and such neutral states as Sweden, Finland and Austria, in their statements, assessed the Soviet proposal submitted for consideration to the United Nations as a concrete, tangible contribution to the extensive programme of promoting international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, in preventing its militarization which meets the aspirations of all mankind. This alone, stressed the delegates of different orientations, makes it possible to put the vast expanses of space--the common property of mankind--at the service of peace and progress, rather than war.

Should weapons be kept out of space, said Indian representative K. Tivari, the peoples will enjoy the fruit of its exploration. Any "co-existence" between the peaceful exploration of space and its transformation into an arena of military confrontation is out of the question, he stressed.

Delegates from many countries, in their speeches, expressed profound concern over the U.S. plans to militarize outer space. Mankind is particularly threatened by the "star wars" programme, said the delegates from Cuba, Bulgaria, Mexico and other countries.

Representatives of the world community declared their support for the agreement, now confirmed at the highest level, on the objective of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva--preventing the militarization of space and reducing nuclear armaments.

The stance of the world community has caused extreme irritation of the United States. Displeased with the criticism against the "star wars" programme at the Special Political Committee, the American delegation sought to doubt the very right of the United Nations and its committee to handle issues of preventing the militarization of outer space.

Tens of delegates repulsed these attempts, stressing that the United Nations is called upon to play a major role in keeping outer space peaceful.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: 'HEATED DEBATES' ON SDI CONTINUE IN U.S.

LD111753 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 11 Dec 85

["SDI: Main Obstacle to Disarmament"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 11 TASS--Heated debates continue in the United States over the "star wars" program and nuclear arms limitation. The press and officials point out that, despite continued differences on questions of principle between the USA and the USSR, the results of the Geneva summit are providing conditions for a transition from confrontation to a search for ways to resolve major problems, including military ones, which could lead to an improvement in the political and psychological climate in international relations.

A number of leading politicians point out that in this situation much positive significance is attached to the basic stipulation, approved in Geneva by the Soviet and U.S. leaders, which formulates the common understanding that nuclear war must never be fought, that there can be no winner in it, and that neither the USSR nor the USA is seeking military superiority. It is also of exceptional importance, it is stressed here, that the joint document approved in Geneva reaffirmed at the summit level the basic goals and tasks of the joint Soviet-American statement adopted on January 8, 1985, namely, the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on earth, the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments and the strengthening of strategic stability.

The "star wars" program is being strongly criticised in the United States in view of all this. Recently, the American Lawyers' Association prepared a paper on a search for effective arms restrictions, which supplies recommendations on the problem, covers its background and attempts an analysis. The American lawyers have drawn the conclusion that the administration's "Strategic Defense Initiative," directed at the deployment of a partially based ABM system, can dramatically accelerate the arms race because it will cause the counterbuildup of the strategic offensive weapons by the USSR. The paper also stresses that the SDI is incompatible with the 1972 ABM Treaty and, if carried through, will smash that treaty. Eventually, the SDI will give an impetus to an absolutely uncontrollable arms race both with offensive and with defensive systems.

The document stresses that substantial opportunities are still existing for working out measures gradually leading to major cuts in offensive nuclear weapons. The lawyers' association sees such opportunities in talks which should proceed from the ABM Treaty. Their starting point should be the strengthening of the treaty itself through the removal of lacunas present in it.

The authors of the report mean by these lacunas those stipulations of the treaty which are deliberately exploited by the American side partially to circumvent it. The lawyers' association advocates the preservation of the ban on extra-laboratory testing and thereby on the deployment of the so-called defensive systems that are being developed under the SDI.

The renunciation of the deployment of the "star wars" systems reiterated in this way, in the view of the authors of the paper, will give an impetus to the limitation of nuclear armaments and the authors suggest that substantial cuts in these armaments should be sought.

While protests against the "star wars" program are mounting in the USA, those forces in the country which are upholding the administration's position as regards the use of space for military purposes have grown more active as well. Spokesmen for the right-wing forces and the military-industrial complex, directly concerned with federal orders for the production and testing of space defense components, are making themselves heard more and more often. Defense Secretary Weinberger, General Abrahamson, who supervises the SDI programs, Deputy Defense Secretary Ikle, Assistant Defense Secretary Perle, presidential science adviser Keyworth and retired General Graham are especially vociferous.

Abrahamson, for instance, stated at congressional hearings on December 10 that the plans to militarize space were aimed at doing away with nuclear armaments and at ridding the whole world of the fear of nuclear war. Abrahamson also tried anew to "fit" the "star wars" program to the ABM Treaty, claiming that the SDI was being carried out with respect for the treaty. Perle for his part, addressing the law-makers the other day, openly stated that the United States was resolved to continue developing space strike weapons under the "star wars" program. If research in the field is a success, he stressed, the deployment of a strategic defense system will be an immediate prospect.

The right-wing forces in the Congress, represented by Senators Jesse Helms and Paul Laxalt and House members Geoffrey Kemp [as received] and Don Edwards, summarily reject any proposed restrictions of the SDI program. They vigorously advocate the repudiation of the ABM Treaty and non-compliance with the SALT-2 accord. This invigoration of SDI advocates is intended to a large extent to squeeze the U.S. Congress for fresh appropriations on that program.

But despite all these efforts of the militarist forces, the U.S. public as a whole, judging by public opinion polls, is aware that the SDI is the main obstacle to nuclear arms limitation. The dangerous character of that program of the U.S. Administration is becoming more and more clear to U.S. public opinion. This is evidenced, inter alia, by the continued campaign of collecting signatures under petitions in which scientists refuse to contribute to SDI research. This campaign has been launched in such major research centres as Cornell, Chicago and Illinois Universities, Ohio State University and the California and Massachusetts technological institutes. Such a petition was signed by ten Nobel Prize winners, among them the well-known physicist Hans Bethe.

As the U.S. press continues to analyze the results of the Geneva summit, it points out, in particular, that through the fault of the U.S. Administration, which was not ready for real progress on key problems, the sides did not reach accord on such basic issues as nuclear arms reductions and non-militarization of space. It notes in this context that the way to the removal of the threat of nuclear war still goes not through the militarization of space but through strengthening universal security and that precisely these matters are fundamental to the condition and development of Soviet-American relations.

The Americans opposed to the arms race point out that the development of space strike systems will dramatically destabilize the entire strategic situation. The assurances of the administration that the SDI has a defensive character are totally at odds with reality. It is perfectly obvious that the going ahead with the U.S. military-space programs, on which the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex insist, would subvert rather than strengthen the security of the United States. In this context a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Geneva is quoted here to the effect that the USSR will not be a passive onlooker at a time when steps are being taken to subvert the security of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Compromise in nuclear arms reductions is possible, the Soviet leader stressed, but only on the condition of a total ban on space strike weapons. If the door to space is tightly shut for weapons, these questions can be resolved.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

USSR'S VELIKHOV REJECTS U.S. CLAIMS ON SOVIET 'SDI'

PM041609 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English 1 Dec 85 p 6

[Interview with Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by special correspondent Vladimir Markov in Geneva: "In the Footsteps of General Keegan"--date of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are Markov introduction]

[Text] Among the materials circulated at the USA press centerstet in Geneva at the time of the summit meeting was one pamphlet issued by the US Departments of Defense and State. It is entitled "Soviet Strategic Defense Programs". Its authors' aim is to prove that the Soviet Union is engaged in developing weapon systems similar to those which are planned under the stet SDI programme. Thus, SDI is advertised as a countermeasure to the Soviet antimissile defence.

The pamphlet also claims that the Soviet Union is using the latest technological achievements, notably laser systems, for antimissile defence. I met Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and asked him to comment on these claims.

"It is blatant juggling of facts," he said. "The research carried out in the Soviet Union into the field of laser technology and that of accelerators to which the pamphlet refers, is not secret. American experts can easily monitor these tests. They are welcome to come to our laboratories and compare notes at scientific conferences. None of the Soviet research programmes involving lasers is aimed at developing antimissile space weapons.

"The pamphlet says, among other things, that by the end of the 1980s the USSR could have prototypes of land-based antimissile lasers. This is a far cry from the reality. I am convinced that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States can develop a land-based laser to hit missile warheads. This view is shared by American scientists," Academician Velikhov went on. "With regards to the laser installation at the Sary-Shagan testing range, it has nothing in common with the functions of antisatellite and antimissile weapons, as the pamphlet claims. This laser installation is intended for the experimental elaboration of the means of laser location of space objects with a view to precisely measuring the parameters of their movement. Incidentally, similar laser-based satellite tracking systems are quite standard and have been in use in the United States for more than ten years.

"Basically, the claims made by American officials to the effect that the Soviet Union spends roughly as much on antimissile defence as it does on strategic armaments are absolutely at odds with the reality," Ye. Velikhov said. "It would be appropriate to recall that in the past in the USA they listened in earnest to the half-witted General George Keegan, now retired, who prophesized, in particular, that in 1980 the Soviet Union would put laser weapons in space and use them to threaten American ballistic missiles. It is ridiculous that similar absurdities are set forth in a pamphlet signed by American officials."

In the opinion of Academician Velikhov, the purpose of the pamphlet and its circulation in Geneva is to secure the consent of US Congress to maintaining the present level of SDI financing, and also to bring pressure to bear on the NATO allies to secure their support for the "star wars" plans.

"The SDI concept and plans have been rejected by an overwhelming majority of scientists in the world," Ye. Velikhov stressed. "This includes the scientists from the USSR and USA, Nobel Prize winners, who recently made a special statement on this question. They are all firmly convinced that attempts to bring the SDI to fruition will destabilize the strategic situation and increase the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

TASS: U.S. SPEEDS UP WEAPONS TESTING UNDER SDI PROGRAM

LD171908 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 17 Dec 85

["United States Speeds Up Creation of Space Strike Arms"--TASS headline]

[Text] New York, December 17 TASS--The newspaper NEW YORK TIMES reported today that tests of space arms in conditions that are close to a real situation of future battles in near-earth space are prepared to be held in the United States in the framework of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) known as the "star wars" program. With a reference to sources in government and scientific institutions, the newspaper writes that these experiments will be connected mainly with the use of laser units on reusable spacecraft of the "shuttle" type. It has been reported in the U.S. press more than once that ground-based and space-based laser weapons are being speedily developed. Now the newspaper writes about development of new types of weapons deployed on spacecraft, that is on the apparatuses capable of manoeuvring in combat operations in near-earth and outer space. The Pentagon leaders are widely using the flights of "shuttle" spacecraft in the experiments to develop space strike arms under the SDI program.

Work to prepare launchings of "shuttle" spacecraft from the West Coast of the USA to a polar orbit exclusively in military purposes is conducted at a high pace at the Vandenberg Air Base in California to widen the range of the operation of "shuttle" spacecraft. According to the newspaper SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, the implementation of such flights connected with the SDI program signifies the opening of a new era.

All these facts show that numerous types of space strike arms are being speedily developed while representatives of the Washington administration talk about the "defensive" nature of the SDI.

The press service of the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES admits that a whole industry already developed around the program of "star wars". This means that the militarization of outer space by Washington is becoming irreversible. A few days ago the administration urgently asked the Congress for an additional appropriation of 100 million dollars for speed up tests of space-based nuclear weapons. So nuclear space arms, too, are being developed in the SDI framework.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

USSR: U.S. GROUPS TRY TO MAKE SDI PROGRESS 'IRREVERSIBLE'

PM131510 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Mozgovoy commentary: "Who Is 'Gold Stone' For?"]

[Text] The U.S. military department has reported the signing of a contract with the McDonnell Douglas Corporation to develop [razrobotka] the (khedi) ABM complex intended to intercept ICBM warheads on reentry. The cost of the deal is almost half a billion dollars. Shortly before this the Pentagon placed an order with the Lockheed Corporation for the creation [sozdaniye] of the Eris ABM system which is to destroy targets in space in the descent phase of their trajectory. Lockheed has been allocated $400 million.

Thus, in just a single month two leading concerns in the U.S. military-industrial complex have obtained almost $1 billion for the implementation of the "star wars" program. The contracts with other subcontractors participating in the development [razrabotka] of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) run into hundreds of millions. And many of these developments [razrabotok] and much of the research is incompatible with the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty. The Eris complex, for instance, is being created [sozdayetsya] on the basis of the Minuteman ICBM and the ABM Treaty prohibits giving these missiles the capability to "resolve tasks of countering strategic ballistic missiles or their elements in flight trajectory and not to test them in an ABM mode [v tselyakh pro]."

This month the Pentagon planned to hold a nuclear test code-named "Gold Stone" at a test range in Nevada. Its aim was to check the potential of a "nuclear-powered" X-ray laser. The United States intends to deploy stations equipped with these lasers in near-earth space in order to hit various targets. These plans contravene the provisions of the treaty on principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space, whose participants pledged not to place in orbit around the earth objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

The Livermore laboratory, which has been designing X-ray lasers, has recently received an additional $60 million from the government. "The program for the creation [sozdaniye] of laser weapons which this laboratory is implementing," the LOS ANGELES TIMES writes, "is continuing to expand at an accelerated pace and is generously financed by the Department of Energy, acting in the role of patron of the laboratory and the organization for the implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative."

What are the Pentagon, the military-industrial concerns, and the other "patrons" of SDI after? To wreck the Soviet-U.S. accord sealed at the Geneva summit between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan on the acceleration of talks on preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth. They are striving to make the process of the slide into "star wars" irreversible.

However, there is widening opposition in the United States to this fatal course. The other day 30 members of the House of Representatives demanded that Defense Secretary C. Weinberger postpone the "Gold Stone" test. The New York Bar Association believes that the only sensible alternative to "star wars" is to strengthen the ABM Treaty, which is the "most important and successful arms control treaty." This viewpoint is shared by many people. After all, SDI's "gold stones" will just enrich the monopolies and not make the U.S. people secure.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

TASS: GARDNER REMARKS CONFIRM SDI AIM OF SUPERIORITY

LD131306 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 13 Dec 85

[Text] New York, December 13 TASS--TASS correspondent Vladislav Orlov reports: High-ranking Pentagon spokesman John Gardner, a deputy director of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" organization, has confirmed that the "star wars" program's aim is to assure the United States of strategic superiority over the Soviet Union.

Speaking at a closed conference of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in Washington recently, he bluntly acknowledged that the SDI, once completed, would tip the nuclear balance heavily in U.S. favor.

The newspaper BOSTON GLOBE reported that he had expounded a nuclear war scenario whereby a partially space-based missile defense would enable the United States to retain a strike force of strategic offensive arms even after a nuclear exchange.

Commenting on the Pentagon official's statement, the paper quoted critics of the SDI as saying the covert rationale behind the program was giving the United States a new advantage in the arms race. Gardner's speech, it observed, had provided a rare example of a highly-placed spokesman confirming those apprehensions.

His admission, THE BOSTON GLOBE said, contradicted statements by President Reagan and other Washington administration officials that the SDI was a purely defensive system that would slow down the arms race and reduce the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war.

According to U.S. press reports, the Washington administration is moving to rev up the "star wars" effort even further. THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER learned, for instance, that President Reagan is going to request $4.5 billion for SDI next fiscal year, which will be a 61 percent increase from the current fiscal year.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

TASS CITES FORMER U.S. OFFICIALS' OPPOSITION TO SDI

LD111128 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 11 Nov 85

[Text] Washington November 11 TASS--Two prominent American military experts, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and former leader of the U.S. delegation to strategic arms limitation talks Gerard Smith, have denounced the Washington administration's notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

Speaking in the NBC television show "Meet the Press", they said the SDI program was geared to upsetting the existing military parity between the United States and the Soviet Union and undercutting fundamental Soviet-American agreements on arms control.

If work under the "Star Wars" program continued, McNamara said, the United States would be moving towards forging capability for a first strike against the Soviet Union. The latter, he warned, would never agree to limit its strategic weapons if the United States carried on the SDI effort.

If the U.S. Administration was bent on deploying a partially space-based missile defense, McNamara said further, America was heading for renunciation of the 1972 Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems. He recalled that six former U.S. defense secretaries had recently issued a joint statement urging the Administration to avoid action which could undermine the ABM treaty and to reach agreement in Geneva to prevent its erosion.

Otherwise, McNamara said, it would be impossible to hammer out an arms limitation agreement in Geneva. He added that the ABM treaty was the foundation for offensive arms control.

Smith said in his statement that some people in the Reagan administration fixed their hopes in the SDI as a means to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union. That posture was a dangerous one, he warned stressing that the USSR's concern about the "Star Wars" program was justified.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

PRAVDA: ACADEMICIAN HAILS U.S. SCIENTISTS' ANTI-SDI STANCE

PM061141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Nov 85 First Edition p 5

[Academician R. Sagdeyev article: "With Scientific Consistency"]

[Text] Broad circles of the U.S. scientific public are expressing their weighty opinions in the discussion now under way in the world around the U.S. Administration's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" [SDI]. It may seem paradoxical why scientists and engineers who all their creative lives have been used to solving scientific and technical problems, including problems of a military nature, are now saying a firm "no" to the new technological spiral in arms production. In its place they propose as the only judicious course a political solution designed to eliminate the nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind. And is it not ironic that it is U.S. Administration figures who are advocating a "technological" solution which, they say, should make nuclear weapons "obsolete and impotent," while the scientists "do not understand" the "humaneness" of this appeal by the advocates of "star wars"?

The U.S. scientists' stance against SDI has been prepared by serious research and analyses and is the result of collective efforts by many prominent scientific figures and public organizations based on academic circles and representing the cream of American science. The essence of their conclusions can be reduced to the concise formula: The many thousand years of escalation of the rivalry between the weapons of attack and defense--the "sword" and the "shield"--which has incidentally always developed in favor of the "sword," has reached the fatal line with the invention of nuclear weapons. The "shield," even if it were capable of deflecting 99 percent of the strikes by the accumulated nuclear arsenal, is now meaningless. The remaining 1 percent is sufficient to paralyze our civilization. At the same time an objective scientific and technical analysis of the prospects for further "competition" between means of attack and defense in the nuclear era shows that the potential for improving offensive weapons is substantially in excess of the reserves for defense. And that means there can be no question of 90 percent of missiles being repulsed.

The organic link between offensive and defensive strategic weapons was recognized by the Soviet Union and the United States in the signing of the

ABM Treaty. The danger of the escalation of competition between means of attack and defense, as inevitably leading to an increase in the level of nuclear confrontation, was confirmed. Our U.S. colleagues, like Soviet scientists too, demonstrate convincingly that no specific new scientific and technical achievements either change or can change the dynamics of the competition between "sword" and "shield."

Concerned scientists are not ceasing their vigorous activity in defense of peace. And the new "hybrid" U.S. strategy, in which it is proposed combining SDI flexibly with "nuclear deterrence," has been subjected to profound scientific analysis. In this case too, scientists have demonstrated its innate strategic instability, for the so-called "'defensive' space screen" can be transformed into a "strike" facility which for a start would put its "twin" in the opposing camp out of action with the first strike (expending here only an insignificant part of its combat potential).

Thus, whichever aspect the space militarization plans are approached from, scientific analysis convincingly exposes their unacceptability, if we are talking of the peaceful development of human civilization.

As far as is known, many representatives of the U.S. scientific world, including major physicists, have already signed a protest petition against the program for creating an ABM defense with space-based elements. I and my colleagues have great respect for the courage and consistency with which U.S. scientists defend their scientific conclusions and convictions which reject the "star wars" program.

Indeed, our countries and peoples and all people on earth have a better prospect--to prevent an arms race in space and halt it on earth, to ensure a reliable peace, and to use pooled scientific resources to resolve the global problems facing mankind. We favor such a shift in international affairs. And we would like the scientific arguments in favor of peace and only peace being expressed in the United States and other countries to be carefully weighed and taken into account.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

USSR'S BOGACHEV ON NEED TO EXTEND 'COMMON GROUND'

LD102143 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 10 Dec 85

["To Extend Common Ground in the Sides' Positions on Problems of Peace"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Dec (TASS)--Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military affairs, writes:

In striving to get the United States' allies to join in the "star wars" program, the Pentagon is counting not only on making use of their laboratories, scientists, and industrial enterprises for the creation of a wide-ranging antimissile defense system for the United States, but also on gaining the right to site on the territory of third states military installations which would ensure the activity of space strike weapons aimed at targets in socialist countries.

In an interview with the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, (Thomas Mayer), one of the heads of the U.S. "star wars" program, stated that the Pentagon intends to deploy powerful laser installations on the territory of its allies in order to supply energy to so-called killer satellites which are planned to be located in space over the socialist countries.

The implementation of such plans naturally would have negative diplomatic consequences and dangerous military consequences for the countries which have decided to cooperate in militarizing space. First, in giving its agreement to the setting up of U.S. antimissile defense installations on their territory, any country becomes a participant in the undermining of one of the most important Soviet-U.S. treaties on the limitation of antimissile defense systems. The 1972 ABM Treaty quite unequivocally forbids the signatories to deploy antimissile defense systems on their components outside their national territories. No "wide" or "narrow" interpretation can change the essence of this provision. The undermining of the ABM Treaty may mean the collapse of the whole process of limitation and cutting of armaments. Second, a country which agrees to set up even components of U.S. antimissile defense on its territory, would willingly or unwillingly become an accomplice of the aggressor in the event "star wars" is unleashed.

The whole world sincerely welcomed the statement by the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting that their task is to prevent an arms race in space and to stop it on earth. All countries of the world without exception can make their contribution to the achievement of this noble aim through practical deeds. It is now important now to permit the aggravation of differences existing between the countries and their allies on the problems of war and peace and to promote the speediest possible attainment of progress in those spheres where there are points of contact between the positions of the sides, to expand the common parts of the positions of the USSR, the United States, and the countries allied with them, which made possible the summit meeting in Geneva.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

TASS: STRATEGIC PARITY 'ESSENTIAL' TO WORLD SECURITY

LD132213 Moscow TASS in English 2142 GMT 13 Dec 85

["SDI Signifies an Increased Confrontation"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 13 TASS--TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) organization has urgently asked additionally 100 million dollars. According to THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, the funds are intended for an accelerated conduct of underground tests of a nuclear device which will be used in a space-based system. One hundred million dollars have been asked for new nuclear tests despite the fact that the Congress has already assigned 282 million dollars to the Department of Energy in the current financial year for the carrying out of SDI-related nuclear weapon testing programs. Besides, 2,700 million dollars have been allocated to the Pentagon in the current financial year for activities within the framework of "star wars."

So, it is a question of creating space weapons within the SDI framework, although all the intensive activities at U.S. military centres and on proving grounds are being presented as "research" ones. In so doing the advocates of the "star wars" program are busy spreading a false version that as of today the SDI is ostensibly only an innocuous scientific quest of "possibilities" for the creation and deployment of "defense systems" in outer space.

This assertion is intended for naive people. Is it possible, for example, to teach a person to swim in a swimming pool without water, even with the aid of the most refined instructions? Or is it possible to make a missile fly on the basis of mathematical calculations in laboratory alone? No such thing ever happens in life. Of course, the SDI advocates refer to the "star wars" program as a "defense" and "research" one with a view to legalizing it and for propaganda purposes, whereas the program virtually envisages U.S. going out into space with weapons for the purpose of ensuring its military superiority.

People in the Soviet Union and all progressive public see reality as it is and not judge it through the Pentagon's advertising booklets. They in Washington go to the lengths of stating that the purpose of the SDI is ostensibly to maintain strategic balance! But if there exists the approximate parity of the strategic potentials of the USA and the USSR now, the parity recognized by the sides, how can it be maintained if the USA will add space strike systems to its arsenal? The newspaper BOSTON GLOBE has reported that John Gardner, assistant director of the SDI organization, in his recent speech in Washington at a closed-door conference of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, stated that the realization of the SDI would sharply change the nuclear balance in favour of the United States.

The point is that the United States does not seek to maintain strategic balance but is trying to upset it, now by means of MX missiles, now by means of cruise missiles and "Midgetman" mobile-based missiles, and is creating other types of weapons as well. The USA now wants to do that by means of the SDI. This is why the "star wars" program is being speeded up at an unprecedented rate. General Abrahamson, director of the SDI organization, in his recent speech at the joint meeting of a number of subcommittees of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has admitted that throughout the current year the level of appropriations for the SDI exceeded those for the needs of all the other military agencies of the USA! This indicates that the Washington strategists are unwilling to reckon with the principle of equal security of the sides. It is essential to get accustomed to a strategic parity as a natural state of bilateral relations. There is no other way out. The results of the recent summit meeting in Geneva create opportunities for a transition from the state of dangerous confrontation to a constructive search for ways to ease tension. The "star wars" program is leading to an increased confrontation.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

USSR: U.S. INCREASING PRESSURE ON JAPAN TO JOIN SDI

TASS Report

LD120718 Moscow TASS in English 0557 GMT 12 Dec 85

[Text] Tokyo December 12 TASS--The United States is busy seeking an urgent adoption of a final decision by Japan on joining in the "star wars" program. After Britain signed an agreement on its participation in the program, Washington has sharply increased pressure on the other allied countries, on Japan in the first place. This is reported by the newspaper MAINICHI with reference to Japanese diplomats.

'Threatening To Create Difficulties'

OW121415 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1146 GMT 12 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] The United States is now striving for Japan to join the "star wars" program. After Britain signed an agreement to take part in this program, the White House has sharply intensified pressure on other countries, primarily Japan.

Generally, this is understandable. The Pentagon generals are interested in the newest technology developed by Japanese scientists and engineers. Pressure on its overseas ally is proceeding literally in all directions. Should the Nakasone government refuse to conclude an agreement on "star wars," Washington is threatening to create difficulties for Japanese companies operating in the United States.

For the time being, the secrets of Japanese laboratories remain inaccessible to the U.S. sponsors of "star wars." Many newspapers reported that everything had been decided and that the United States had the newest missile guidance technology developed in Japan in the bag, as one might say. However, nothing turned out to be as simple as that. Wishes had been passed off as reality. We have already said more than once that the arms race is directly connected with making money, with obtaining profit. The desire to gain big profits often turns out to be a determining factor. So it turned out this time as well. The Japanese Government demands Y10 billion for the missile technology.

The KYODO news agency wrote that the U.S. Administration is openly reproaching its friend and ally for its ingratitude and self-interest, and is reminding it of the contribution of the U.S. industrial complex in restoring and building up the Japanese military industry.

The Japanese are, as always, smiling and nodding their heads in agreement, but at the same time are saying they will not give in for anything--Y10 billion and not a yen less.

An argument is an argument, but one can be sure that this issue will ultimately be settled. The strategic interests of the two countries coincide completely. The Nakasone government has repeatedly proven that it is prepared to support U.S. aggressive aspirations.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

MOSCOW TV: U.S. PAPERS, PUBLIC OPPOSE 'STAR WARS'

LD060348 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 5 Nov 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] In acquainting myself with the press of various countries I notice that the period has ended in which there was a predominance in the West of such sports terminology as who scored how many goals, the Geneva talks will end in a draw or which of the sides has the better chance of victory. Even many papers and periodicals which formerly did not spare black paint in abundant criticism of any Soviet peace talks ought to be considered attentively and that they inspire hope. However, the key question, as before, remains the U.S. Administration's desire to take the race into space. Moreover, recently there has arisen the dangerous tendency toward judicially legalizing the militarization of space, to bring some kind of bases of legality to the Pentagon's militarist aspirations. I am thinking of the reinterpretation--more directly a new and distinctive interpretation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems of 1972.

This treaty says: Each of the sides undertakes not to create [sozdavat], test or deploy [razvertyvat] systems of or components of antimissile defenses based at sea, in the air, in space, I emphasize space in this. It would seem that in this absolutely precise formulation there is no room for a variant reading.

All the same there are people in Washington who consider that 1972 is one thing and 1985 something quite different. The star wars program--that is exactly what the Americans call antimissile space systems--in their opinion do not come under the treaty's ban. Thus, the obligation taken on by Washington does not relate to this.

Such a distortion of the provisions of the treaty has provoked the indignation of supporters of arms control in the United States itself, as well as in London and Bonn. On this subject the BOSTON GLOBE wrote: Any interpretation of the treaty on the basis of common sense presupposes that it bans any measures at all in the context of the program to create space weapons. The danger which threatens the process of arms control has never before been so evident as now, when a dishonorable row has arisen about the 1972 treaty.

President Reagan rushed to dissociate himself from such statements and Secretary of State George Shultz in a number of speeches confirmed that the United States would adhere to the generally accepted interpretation of the provisions of the treaty. It would seem that everything is in order. Even the BOSTON GLOBE noted that the danger threatening the treaty had apparently disappeared. The hands in the Pentagon had been beaten. If only it were all so simple.

I have before me excerpts from a quite new interview by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger published in the 1 November issue of the French weekly EXPRESS.

Question: Will the treaty of 1972 on limiting antimissile defense systems be a barrier on the path to the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the Strategic Defense Initiative, for which read the star wars system?

Reply: No, in no way.

This is said by none other than the defense secretary, the man who takes most active part in formulating the country's political course. And pay attention to the fact that while the defenders of the star wars program are attempting to convince the world that it is allegedly simply a question of future scientific research, Weinberger with his characteristic directness is conducting a conversation already about deployment [razvertyvaniye], and siting [razmeshcheniye] of weapons in space.

The President's aim is to go ahead until the possibility arises of demonstrating the effectiveness of the defense system capable of destroying Soviet missiles outside the atmosphere, he said. It is vital that we work out such a system first, for if the Russians work it out first, nothing could prevent them from inflicting a first strike. We reject the fabrications--which set one's teeth on edge--about the aggressiveness of the Russians and this utterance could be addressed to Mr Weinberger himself. And what, tell me, prevents the United States from inflicting a first strike from behind the cover of a space shield?

The latest public opinion poll in the United States shows that the overwhelming majority--three-quarters of the country's population--currently consider that it is far more important to achieve a reduction in nuclear arsenals than to waste money on creating space weapons. Such is the opinion of the people--it should be heeded.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

MOSCOW TV: SDI 'CHAMPIONS' ACTING 'MORE VIGOROUSLY' AFTER GENEVA

LD030258 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2032 GMT 2 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Looking through reports from Washington, one sees how stubbornly the champions of space militarization defend the star wars program. I believe that they have been acting even more vigorously following Geneva. A former director of the USAF space program, Robert Bowman, has declared that the White House is forcing the program not to defend the United States from missiles, but to secure American control of space.

Plans for development [sozdaniye] and deployment of strike space weapons are the creation of the American military-industrial complex. The West German SPIEGEL magazine writes that the U.S. military industry has been determining Washington and NATO's strategic conceptions to a significant extent for a long time now. American arms-producing corporations have concluded that the star wars program is their future. Entry into space is intended to ensure orders for U.S. military concerns for the next 30 years at the very least. As early as the seventies, reminds the SPIEGEL, the aviation and space concern Rockwell International published a document entitled "Space--American Frontier for Growth, Leadership, and Freedom." This pretentious document simply exudes imperial spirit. Its authors suggest that the restoration of America's national grandeur be sought through the occupation of outer space and that space stations with nuclear weapons, guaranteeing the United States' secure mastery over all armed forces, be deployed at the beginning of the next century. Rockwell International formulated its instructions for the American Government in a simple way; namely, world supremacy. That way, it programmed the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative long before President Reagan.

The rate of that initiative's implementation is determined by 12 major U.S. military concerns, including Boeing, McDonnell-Douglas, Lockheed, Martin Marietta and, of course, Rockwell International. Thanks to its power and influence, U.S. big capital firmly strives to program the SDI during President Reagan's sojourn at the White House and to prevent negotiations with the Soviet Union on it.

For big American capital, to conduct negotiations with Moscow on this issue, SPIEGEL concludes, would be even more absurd than to hold debates on how to blow up Wall Street.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN DENIES SDI BENEFITS ECONOMY

PM171204 Madrid EL PAIS in Spanish 7 Dec 85 p 5

[Article by Aleksey Vasilyev, chief of the Politico-Military Problems Department of the United States of America and Canada Institute (Academy of Sciences): "'Star Wars' and Private Research"]

[Text] Of the arguments brandished by Washington and some pro-U.S. West Europeans in favor of West European participation in the SDI program, one of the prime positions is occupied by the theory that any country that forgoes participation in this program will be excluded from technological and scientific progress, since the large expenditure on this undertaking will inevitably impart a strong boost to such progress in civilian sectors, too.

Everything seems to indicate that this argument worries politicians more than businessmen. At a conference in Bonn in May attended by ministers of defense, research, foreign relations, finance, and economy and by many representatives of major FRG industries including the Defense Ministry's main contractors (the MBB, Dornier, and Siemens groups), it was indeed the industrialists who expressed their anxiety about the possibility that the FRG's participation in SDI might reduce subsidies allocated to other research programs.

When analyzing the entire history of the postwar development of the U.S. economy's military sector, it becomes clear that research and development projects, which devour huge resources, have never had a stimulating effect on technological and scientific progress or served as essential sources of innovation.

Since the fifties some 80 percent of the resources allocated to research and development have been paid on the Pentagon's behalf to the major firms which are not suppliers but, rather, consumers of inventions and discoveries principally achieved by medium and small enterprises.

Even when major firms--which absorb huge sums in the form of state allocations for research contracts--do produce patents it seems that most of them are not in the field of generously financed military research and that of the patents which do have a military application, only an insignificant proportion are used in civilian manufacturing.

According to figures issued by the Texas Instruments firm, for instance, from 1949 through 1959 only 5 of the 112 patents taken out by the company had to do with work carried out within the framework of military contracts and only 2 of these were subsequently marketed.

The very nature of military research and its orientation toward the creation of missile systems and specialized electronic equipment designed to use in nuclear warfare show that they are unlikely to be applied to peaceful ends.

Detailed scientific analysis shows that direct civilian research is capable of yielding a much greater economic effect than the commercial use of the results achieved from military research.

An Exaggeration

So the claims that SDI will act as a stimulus to economic growth are simply a vast exaggeration. In this connection Lewis Branscomb, vice president of scientific research for the multinational IBM, said that "this effect will obviously be insignificant." An even more pessimistic conclusion was reached by the authors of the report of the committee on economic priorities, who stated unambiguously that the "star wars" program could supplant research of real commercial importance, using private companies' most highly qualified scientists for its own purposes.

"Compared to the Europeans we are advancing at a snail's pace," the U.S. daily THE NEW YORK TIMES anxiously comments, citing the opinion of leading scientists. The U.S. Administration's support for the plans for the militarization of outer space leaves those U.S. businessmen whose plans depend on the use of this program for commercial ends without much hope of success in the competitive struggle with European firms, which now enjoy much greater backing from their respective governments.

From the viewpoint of West European businessmen, closer cooperation with the United States on the SDI program and the threat of increasing protectionism in various branches of civilian production threaten to lose them their positions in that great and promising market.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1203

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TASS ON LOCKHEED CONTRACT--Washington November 8 TASS--The Pentagon has announced that an order for the production of the so-called subsystem for the interception of warheads beyond the atmosphere has been awarded to the Lockheed Missiles and Space Corporation, a major arms manufacturing company. As a spokesman for the Pentagon claimed, this project is the most promising one in the system of space strike weapons being created under the "star wars" program. Under the terms of the contract, the Lockheed Corporation is to develop, manufacture and test in the course of five years the latest ground-based missile capable of destroying objectives outside the atmosphere. Albeit the total cost of the project is kept secret, the spokesman for the Pentagon described it as the most "expensive one" under the "star wars" program now. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 8 Nov 85 LD] /6091

PRAVDA ON U.S. 'COMPACT' REACTOR--Washington, 24 Nov--The "star wars" program being accelerated by the Pentagon has undergone new development. An administration decision has been announced here that the Hanford National Laboratory at Richland, one of the U.S. Energy Department's research centers, will tackle the development [razrabotka] of a compact nuclear reactor to power components of the space "shield." The project is to be completed by 1991. Its implementation will cost $480 million; its capacity is 300 kilowatts. The administration decision not only refutes its own claim that the "space defense" being created [sozdavayemyy] by the United States will be "nonnuclear." It also eloquently illustrates the statement which General Abrahamsom, director of the space militarization program, made recently that he is "awaiting instructions" from Washington to forge ahead "much more quickly and effectively" in the matter of realizing it. [By V. Gan] [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 85 Second Edition p 5 PM] /6091

TASS ON U.S. X-RAY LASER RESEARCH--New York November 27 TASS--According to a report in the newspaper BOSTON GLOBE, Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, head of the programme for the implementation of the "strategic defence initiative," said that the Pentagon has decided to speed up the creation of space weapons using the energy of nuclear blasts. According to the newspaper, the point at issue are X-ray lasers. We are convinced that the programme of creation of X-ray lasers should be accelerated as far as possible and we are taking measures in that direction, Abrahamson stressed. As John Pike, member of the Federation of American Scientists, said, nearly 200 million dollars are to be spent in 1986 fiscal year to develop that type of weapon. A prototype laser codenamed "Excalibur" has already four times been tested in a nuclear proving range in Nevada. These tests are being held contrary to the claims that the star wars programme is a "non-nuclear" and research one, the newspaper BOSTON GLOBE stresses. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 27 Nov 85 LD] /6091

TASS: U.S. EXPERTS DISAGREE--New York November 30 TASS--Military and technical experts immediately associated with the realization of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" deny the Washington Administration's statements concerning the allegedly "defensive" character of the "Star Wars" program. The New York TIMES quotes defense industry executives and Pentagon officials who attended the conference of space technology in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as saying that "individual components of an ABM system with space-based elements clearly have potential to be turned into devastating offensive weapons." These, the New York TIMES goes on, include both space and ground-based lasers "which could be used to assist a nuclear first strike." Certain of the weapons for the development of which the "Star Wars" program calls could also be used "for instantaneous strikes against ground targets." [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 30 Nov 85 LD] /6091

TASS ON U.S. EXPERTS' 'CONCERN'--Washington, December 11 TASS--Prominent American arms experts, during hearings at the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, have pointed to mounting anxiety in Western Europe over the White House's plans to militarize outer space. According to Samuel Wells, deputy director of the Woodrow Wilsom International Centre, American allies are seriously concerned over many major aspects of the "Strategic Defence Initiative". An overwhelming majority of political leaders, government officials, news analysts and scientists, he said, have substantial reservations regarding SDI. Assistant Secretary of Defence Richard Perle, however, who zealously backs the "star wars" programme, stressed at the hearings the Reagan administration's commitment to the continued effort in establishing a partially space-based anti-missile defence system. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0705 GMT 11 Dec 85 LD] /6091

TASS ON REAGAN INTERVIEW--Washington, December 12 TASS--President Reagan has given an interview to a group of West European journalists. In the interview he devoted much attention to the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. The President said that the conversations with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Geneva were open and serious. "We agreed on some things, and disagreed on much else", the President pointed out. "But we agreed that deeds and not words will be necessary to make real and lasting progress in our relations". "Although there are significant differences which still separate the sides, General Secretary Gorbachev and I have agreed that our arms control negotiations should accelerate their work towards arms control agreements which provide for significant reductions and increased stability". At the same time the head of the U.S. Administration made it clear in the interview that the United States does not intend to drop its "star wars" programme. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0744 GMT 12 Dec 85 LD] /6091

TASS ON FRENCH CONFERENCE--Paris, December 12 TASS--TASS correspondent Yuriy Kopatin reports: What France should do in the military field to respond to Washington's "star wars" programme was the subject of a closed-door "science and defence" conference held at the Palaiseau Polytechnical Institute [Parisian suburb]. The conference sponsored by the French Ministry of Defence was attended by war experts and scientists. Reports which have leaked into local press say that most participants concluded that the U.S.-praised "space shield" could not guarantee security at all and that the opposite side will inevitably modernize its destructive means as an effective retaliatory measure, should such a "shield" be created. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT 12 Dec 85 LD] /6091

MOSCOW NOTES U.S. TEST--As part of its acceleration of the implementation of the "star wars" program, Washington has carried out the latest test on one of the prototypes of the armaments which will be used in the antimissile defense system with space-based elements. At Maxwell Laboratories in California, a demonstration was given of the action of an electromagnetic gun designed to hit intercontinental ballistic missiles. A projectile weighing around 100 grams was fired at a steel target at a speed in excess of 96,000 km/h. [From the "Vremya" newscast] [Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Dec 85 LD] /6091

CSO: 5200/1203

IZVESTIYA CRITICIZES U.S. VOTES ON UN ARMS RESOLUTIONS

PM231854 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Dec 85 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Own correspondent V. Soldatov dispatch: "Strengthening Peace, Developing Cooperation; Results of the UN General Assembly Session"]

[Excerpt] The 40th, jubilee, session of the UN General Assembly ended on an optimistic note. But that optimism was restrained and cautious, if one can put it that way. It was accompanied by riders and regret that through the fault of the U.S. side it had not been possible to resolve problems of paramount importance for the fate of civilization.

The optimism was linked with Geneva and the fact that the Soviet-U.S. summit had finally taken place and reflected the intention to improve relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and to achieve reductions in weapons of destruction. The restraint was to be explained by the fact that it was not possible to reach agreement on arms reductions in Geneva.

In the general discussion, the discussion of specific measures which could promote the resolution of this urgent problem, and later in the voting on resolutions the difference in the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States — the countries on which the removal of the nuclear danger largely depends — was clearly evident. The Soviet position was clear and definite — to end the arms race on earth and prevent it in space. In recent months the Soviet Union has put forward a number of important initiatives which have attested to its readiness to strive for a radical solution to this urgent problem. These initiatives were highly assessed by most delegations.

The U.S. position was different. In words the U.S. representatives advocate strengthening peace. In practice they have opposed the reaching of agreements on security and disarmament questions. The sole concession to public opinion by the U.S. delegation was a certain easing off of the rhetoric, which, as one of the delegates noted, was mainly to be explained by the danger of being isolated at the jubilee session.

The negative U.S. position was particularly obvious at the concluding stage of the session, when voting took place on the resolutions that had been discussed in committee. The U.S. delegation came out against virtually all resolutions aimed at reducing the nuclear threat. The United States voted against the resolutions on a nuclear arms freeze, on banning the development and production of new types of mass destruction weapons and weapons systems, and on banning the development, production, and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and on ensuring their destruction. Only the United States and Grenada abstained on the resolution on preventing an arms race in space, which was submitted by the nonaligned countries and was supported even by Washington's closest allies.

The U.S. delegation opposed the resolution on the immediate ending and banning of nuclear weapons tests. This step is entirely in keeping with the Republican administration's recent actions to further escalate the arms race, primarily the building up of the pace of research work linked with the implementation of the program for the creation of space strike weapons. After all, it is no secret that during the experiments and tests that are currently being conducted new and even more dangerous types and sorts of mass destruction weaponry are being devised and improved.

The overwhelming majority of UN states have long and persistently advocated the total and unconditional ending of nuclear tests by all nuclear powers.

In this respect the Soviet Union set an example of goodwill in announcing the introduction 6 August this year of a unilateral moratorium on such tests and expressing readiness to ban them on a permanent basis if the United States acted accordingly. Moreover, the Soviet Government proceeded on the basis that a test ban is not just an effective measure capable of serving as one of the obstacles in the way of a further nuclear arms race but is also a favorable prerequisite for eliminating the nuclear arsenals that have already been accumulated. Washington, however, immediately hastened to declare this peace initiative of the USSR's "yet another of Moscow's propaganda tricks."

The members of the international community assessed the Soviet Union's actions in quite another way. Delegates from any countries stressed that this gives the world a unique channe to stop the endless improvement of nuclear arms and to lead to a virtual immobilization [omertvleniye] of stockpiles of nuclear weapons. The conclusion of a multilateral treaty banning nuclear weapons tests by all states would be an inalienable element of the successful completion of efforts to reverse the nuclear arms race and prevent it spreading to new countries. The overwhelming majority of delegates voted for this resolution.

In voting against over 30 resolutions on disarmament questions the United States demonstrated its total disregard for the aspirations of the majority of UN countries and displayed yet again its intention to distance the United Nations from the solution of problems linked with nuclear arms.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REVIEWS 40TH UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION

LD190030 Moscow TASS in English 2301 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Excerpts] New York, 19 Dec (TASS)--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly closed here on Wednesday.

The jubilee forum of the biggest and most authoritative international organization, held on the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism and militarism as a result of which the United Nations was founded, was marked by the aspiration of an overwhelming majority of members of the world community to undertake collective efforts in order to turn developments for the better, diminish the risk of nuclear war, and terminate the arms race on earth and prevent it in outer space.

The world community, the governments of many countries extended broad support to the Soviet Union's large-scale initiatives on the central issues of peace and security. According to the unanimous opinion, the work of the session focused on the Soviet Union's concept of "star peace" advanced to counter the sinister plans of "star wars".

Thanks to the efforts by the USSR and other socialist states, by peace-loving non-aligned countries which actively backed them, the General Assembly adopted extremely important decisions on preventing the arms race in outer space, came out in favour of stopping and banning nuclear weapon tests, and approved a series of resolutions on concrete steps in curbing the arms race in all its directions.

It is indicative that during voting on an overwhelming majority of resolutions related to the issues of disarmament and strengthening world security the U.S. delegation voted against, upholding the course towards continuing the arms race, especially the implementation of the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative."

According to U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar, president of the 40th session Jaimer de Pinies, most delegates to the session, the Geneva meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, a major event of international life in the recent time, became the most important factor in the work of the session.

Noting the extremely favourable influence of the positive results of the Geneva meeting on the world climate, above all the very fact of the dialogue established between the two great powers, the top-level confirmation of the fact that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, representatives of the international community expressed the hope for materialization of its results.

In several resolutions adopted, including those directly addressed to the participants in the Soviet-American talks, the General Assembly stressed the need for achieving effective accords in the vital interests of all peoples on ending the arms race, reducing nuclear arsenals, preventing the arms race in space and using space for peaceful purposes.

On the whole, the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly, at a tense period when world development has approached a dangerous mark, was able to define basic reference points and directions for resolving the chief task of our time, called for mastering the great science of living together for the sake of averting the war menace, and preserving civilization and very life on earth.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

USSR'S UN DELEGATES VIEW UNGA 40TH SESSION

'Favorable' Results

LD190911 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Dec 85

[Text] The UN General Assembly is completing its discussion of the whole range of questions of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. Our correspondent asked the USSR's permanent representative at the United Nations, Comrade Troyanovskiy, to comment on the results of the discussion.

[Troyanovskiy] It must be said that, of course, the United Nations Organization is, in a sense, a reflection of the real world in which we live and in which various forces with both positive and negative charges are operating. Attempts are therefore being made to deflect, as it were, the United Nations from the positive course that was set for it by the authors of its Charter 40 years ago. Nonetheless, I think I shall in no way distort the truth if I say that the results of this session have been entirely favorable to the Soviet Union. First of all, one must note the important resolution that was adopted, and which envisages measures against the continuation of the arms race on earth and against extending it into space.

That resolution was adopted and supported by practically all the countries of the world, and it has to be noted that only one state, the United States, failed to support that resolution, which fully reflects, as it were, and corresponds to, the Soviet position in this sphere.

USSR Ambassador

LD201931 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Text] New York, December 20 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly patently confirmed the priority task of all peoples: to ensure mankind's survival, to stop the arms race on earth and prevent it in space, said USSR's permanent ambassador to the United Nations Oleg Troyanovskiy. It is not accidental that the General Assembly adopted by 151 votes, the greatest number of votes ever given for a document put to vote, adopted the resolution on the prevention of the arms race in space worked out with active cooperation of many delegations, he said at a press conference at the United Nations headquarters on the results of the session. Only the United States and Grenada abstained from voting.

Combined with another resolution, on international cooperation in peaceful uses of outer space, the international community declared unambiguously in favour of keeping space peaceful, of closing firmly the door to putting arms into space.

The session has shown that the overwhelming majority of states pay ever more attention to the vital need to ultimately put an end to nuclear weapon tests. The unilateral moratorium imposed by the Soviet Union on any nuclear explosions, the call of heads of state and governments to extend the moratorium with their assistance evoked the broadest of response at the session. The Soviet side proclaimed the readiness to extend the moratorium if it is joined by the United States, having fully ensured the solution of all questions of verification. The United States actually exhausted all pretexts for refusing to end nuclear tests.

On the whole the jubilee session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted many important decisions aimed at solving acutest problems of the present, promoted enhancing the prestige and efficiency of the United Nations organisation for whose consolidation the Soviet Union has declared consistently, Oleg Troyanovskiy noted.

USSR's Petrovskiy

LD251759 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 25 Dec 85

[Excerpt]

Moscow, December 25 TASS -- The 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly has been a pointer to the growing understanding that the present-day tense situation in the world calls for a new political thinking, a realistic and responsible approach to solution of existing acute international problems, said Vladimir Petrovskiy, member of the USSR delegation to the U.N. session.

He made a speech at a press conference, held here today on the results of the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

The participants in the session, said Vladimir Petrovskiy, displayed a profound interest in success of the Soviet-American summit meeting which was held at that period, and called upon the leaders of both countries to promote attainment of constructive agreements on nuclear and space armaments.

The Soviet Union-raised question of development of international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space led to concentration of the session's attention on the main problem of our time -- prevention of the arms race in outer space. We backed the resolution which demands that the arms race be prevented from spreading to outer space and that the states should refrain from any actions contrary to that aim.

The Soviet Union believes that a world space organization can not only ensure broad international cooperation in exploration of outer space with the participation of developing countries, but could also become the centre to control the prevention of the arms race in outer space, said Vladimir Petrovskiy.

Answering questions of journalists, participants in the press conference noted that the United States was exerting pressure on its allies to broaden the political front of SDI supporters so as to have an opportunity to speak on behalf of its allies and use their scientific-technological potential. The United States is especially interested in attracting the FRG to the Strategic Defense Initiative since it considers Bonn its main NATO ally in Europe.

The absolute majority of the U.N. member states welcomed the moratorium on any nuclear explosions which was introduced unilaterally by the Soviet Union, and called upon the other nuclear powers to accede to it. There is now a real chance to have nuclear explosions ended. The United States has every opportunity to respond to aspirations of the people of the whole world and come to terms with the Soviet Union on mutual moratorium on any nuclear explosions, and this chance should not be missed, said Vladimir Petrovskiy.

The USSR is ready to agree to far-reaching accords also in questions of control that American representatives frequently refer to, he said. In establishing now mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions the USSR is ready to agree with the United States also on some measures of control locally to remove possible doubts as to compliance with the moratorium. The problem of control cannot thus be considered as an obstacle to attaining an agreement on mutual moratorium.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S LT GEN VOLKOGONOV COMMENTS ON POTENTIAL FOR WAR, PEACE

LD221103 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 21 Dec 85

[From the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program; commentary by "military specialist" Lieutenant General Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov]

[Text] Our talk today is about the pontentials for war and peace, the confrontation between which reflects the chief contradiction of our age.

The policy of imperialist circles, which are ready to sacrifice the destinies of whole peoples, continues to maintain the danger of a global military conflict. Attention was drawn to this by the Soviet side at the Geneva meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States which took place last month. The problem of war and peace, it was stressed, has become the most acute one today. It is truly a problem concerning the destiny of the world community — its present and its future. The circles which unleashed a bloody war against Vietnam, which have been blockading Cuba for many years, which intervened in Lebanon, which seized defenseless Grenada, and which are encouraging aggressive action against Nicaragua, the Palestinians, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Angola, present themselves today as the forces of war.

Everyone knows that the capital of these forces today lies across the ocean — in Washington. The draft new edition of our party Program defines U.S. imperialism today as the citadel of international reaction and the chief source of war. Essentially this is what the potential for war is, embodied now by the military-industrial complex of the United States and its NATO allies. That complex, which is described in depth by the draft document, includes the monopolies which devour fantastically large military budgets, the imperialist top brass, the state bureaucracy, the ideological apparatus, and militarized science. The Draft Program describes the arms race, which is unprecedented in its scale, as one of imperialism's greatest crimes against the peoples. However, the Draft Program of our party, being profoundly optimistic in its essence, draws the conclusion that war can be prevented and mankind can be saved from the inconceivable catastrophe thanks to the existence of a growing potential for peace which is continuously gaining in strength. Based on a theoretical and political analysis, the party document includes among the elements in that potential first and foremost the peace-loving policies of the socialist states with their economic and defense might, the policies of the overwhelming majority of developing states which have a vital interest in preserving peace, and the broad antiwar democratic movement of the popular masses on all continents throughout the planet.

The Draft Program of our party expresses very forcefully the profound conviction of the Soviet people that the future belongs to socialism, but that the historic dispute between the two systems, as the document stresses, can and must be solved by peaceful means. However, while imperialism is not ready to adopt in practice a policy of peaceful coexistence, which is shown by real events, we are forced, as the document stresses, to attach primary importance to strengthening the country's defense capacity and defending the socialist fatherland. After all, one cannot but take into consideration today the fact that although imperialism cannot in fact win a nuclear war, it is capable of starting one. The defense of socialism under the current conditions, therefore, has become one of the most important elements in the struggle for the survival of civilization and the preservation of peace.

If we think about what the essence is of all the proposals and programs that are put forward by the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries, they boil down to a clear concept: The immediate task is to remove the direct threat of nuclear war. The next task is to reduce the likelihood of nuclear war still further. And the ultimate task, as the Draft Program says, is to eliminate the possibility of its breaking out.

It was this concept that lay behind the specific proposals that the Soviet Union submitted at the Soviet-U.S. talks on the whole range of problems: space, strategic nuclear weapons, and medium-range missiles. The preservation of peace and the security of peoples has turned out to be interconnected as never before with the possibilities that the Soviet Union and its allies have at their disposal for their defense. The greatest guarantees of security against the militarist challenge by the United States and

NATO lie in the capability of socialism to maintain a military strategic parity. The establishment of that parity is described in the Draft Program of our party as a historic achievement of socialism. The parity that has been achieved in strategic force has consolidated the position of our country and the other countries of socialism and has overturned the imperialist circles' calculations of victory in a nuclear war. And the defense of socialism takes as its starting point a most important political premise: that of keeping the Armed Forces at a level that rules out the strategic superiority of imperialism. This capability of socialism to maintain the correlation of forces as a parity, a balance which, through the fault of the United States, is at a very high level today, provides the most important material guarantees of security that serve the whole world.

In the nuclear age problems of war and peace face mankind in a ruthlessly acute and definitely threatening way. With reference to the Leninist teachings about war and peace that are developed in the draft new document, one may say that there are three basic possibilities for solving this fundamental question: peaceful coexistence, brinkmanship on the edge of war, or nuclear apocalypse. Which of these possibilities is put into practice depends, of course, not only on those people who look at the whole of mankind through the crosshairs of a gun sight. In the final analysis the destiny of war and peace, and the future of mankind, depend on those forces which personify the negation of nuclear war as a means of solving the chief contradiction of the age. In the new edition of the party Program these questions are discussed with exhaustive precision and clarity. The potential for peace can and must prevent the monstrous potential for war from manifesting itself. One of the most important elements in the potential for peace today is the Soviet Armed Forces, the personnel of which have done, and will continue to do, everything to guarantee the security of the socialist fatherland.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

PRAVDA 22 DECEMBER REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM221613 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Tomas Kolensichenko "International Review"]

[Excerpt]

Pondering over how the departing year could be crowned and the new year greeted, people throughout the world are now turning their eyes and thoughs toward the Soviet initiatives aimed at limiting and ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons which threaten life itself on earth. As is well known, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions expires 1 January. But as M.S. Gorbachev recently confirmed, if the moratorium becomes mutual, if the United States associates itself to it, then it will be extended beyond 1 January 1986. A joint Soviet-U.S. moratorium on any nuclear explosions would be a major milestone on the path toward eliminating the nuclear peril. This is a unique chance. And it must not be allowed to slip away.

When talk turns to the moratorium, some people in the West, especially in the United States, immediately put forward objections connected with the fact that it is allegedly very difficult to monitor and therefore has no real point. Of course, these are all excuses, because even nonspecialists already know of the existence of reliable national means making it possible to monitor any nuclear explosions. Incidentally, the Americans were convinced of this not so long ago, when they carried out an undeclared small-yield nuclear explosion. It was recorded immediately.

But to advance this problem from a standstill with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of monitoring, the Soviet side — special note must be made of this -- supported the idea of using an international system of verification. Moreover, the Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. It is in favor, if a mutual moratorium is established now on nuclear explosions, on reaching agreement with the United States on several on-the-spot monitoring measures. This step would definitively remove any doubts about the observance of this moratorium after which the actual problem of monitoring could not longer viewed as an obstacle on the path of a mutual agreement.

How is Washington reacting to the Soviet initiative? Instead of an explicit and positive reply, a negative reaction is issuing from it. Here a certain nervous confusion is to be noted, because the United States has now been compelled to justify itself to the whole world without having any real arguments.

How else to assess the extensive statements at a press conference by White House spokesman L. Speakes, who was like a cat on a hot tin roof in front of journalists? On the one hand he assured those present of the administration's adherence to the "process of cooperation" between the United States and the USSR on the question of halting nuclear tests yet on the other he frankly stated: The United States is opposed to a moratorium. Here he scaled "pinnacles" of logic which baffled hard-bitten jouranlists.

While "welcoming" the Soviet position on monitoring, Speaks at the same time said that "this question is, however, a separate question from the moratorium on nuclear explosions." But how can that be so? After all it was none other than the U.S. side which constantly asserted that it was the question of monitoring which was the pivotal issue of a moratorium and that until it was resolved it was impossible to reach an agreement. But now that the monitoring problem is entirely soluble, Washington is rejecting its own words and arguments.

Of course, the point lies somewhere else. The United States simply does not want to abandon the buildup of nuclear weapons. And for that it needs tests. Even Washington admits that. "The tests carried out by the United States," the U.S. capital has declared, "are necessary to be sure of preserving the effectiveness of our deterrent potential and to be sure of the reliability and security of U.S. arsenals while we actively engage in research into the technologies which will one day reduce our dependence on offensive armaments. Nuclear arms will remain in the foreseeable future the key element of our deterrent potential. In a situation where the United States and our allies must rely on nuclear arms with a view to curbing aggression, nuclear tests are needed."

"Curbing aggression" -- that is propaganda cover. But the thrust of the problem can still be seen. After all, "research into technologies" is nothing other than the "star wars" program. The United States is thus planning to put strike weapons into space while at the same time building up its ground-based offensive nuclear arsenals.

Washington's position has given rise to a stormy reaction throughout the world. "Washington is simply resorting to propaganda maneuvering," the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN writes indignantly, noting that "the conclusion of a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear tests is most necessary."

Just days remain to the new year. Are nuclear tests to be or not to be? A question which now perturbs all mankind. And if the U.S. Administration wants to heed that voice there is still time.

The Feeding Trough and the Mousetrap

In the capitalist countries the fruit of the scientific-technical revolution are put at the service of the ruling forces' selfish interests. They "work" not for peace but for war, intensifying the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Here the United States and its allies, using various embargoes and lists of "prohibited" goods and other restrictions, are essentially waging a technological war against the socialist world. Their cherished aim is to isolate the socialist countries from modern scientific and technical achievements and to delay their economic development. And they themselves want to accomplish a technological breakthrough, to "break loose," to forge ahead, and disrupt the military-strategic parity in their favor.

In that sense the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," in other words the "star wars" program which the United States is nurturing, is a classic example. Whatever the "defensive" clothing in which its authors dress the SDI, it remains what it really is -- a program for putting into space destructive weapons which, under cover of a "shield," it is planned to use to deliver a first strike. (after all, in propagandizing SDI as a "defensive weapon," the Pentagon has not abandoned a single so-called "offensive" weapons program through the year 2000. It is for their development and interaction with SDI that the Pentagon intends to continue these same nuclear tests).

That is the aim for which the United States intends to use the fruit of the scientific-technical revolution, the most sophisticated technological achievements, and scientific ideas and inventions. That is why X-ray and chemical lasers, particle beam weapons, electromagnetic guns, weapons based on kinetic energy, orbital mirrors, and other unprecedented means of destruction are being developed. Here Washington is operating on the "don't spare the ammunition" principle. Nor the money. As U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, which is very well informed on these issues, notes, "the 'star wars' project is now on the way to becoming the biggest feeding trough in the history of scientific research... According to preliminary estimates, SDI, which is geared to 30 years, could require $1 trillion. Even now, the 'smell of cooking' has attracted defense subcontractors, university laboratories, and high-technology industry [tekhnikoyemkoy promyshlennosti] firms." They all want to grab their share of this gigantic sum. The so-called "research" projects, according to reports in TIME magazine, have already been seized by 20 large firms, 200 smaller firms, and a dozen universities.

This also creates social problems. An increasing number of the best engineering and technical and scientific cadres in the United States are working for the monopolies of the military-industrial complex which dominates the U.S. economy. "The problem now," THE WASHINGTON POST notes, "is to prevent U.S. culture from being turned into a completely militarized culture." In this connection the newspaper directly asks: "Has it not turned out that the U.S. military industry has acquired such influence that it has begun to determine foreign policy instead of serving it?"

The question hits the nail on the head, as they say. Let's recall just the concept of the "window of vulnerability." It became firmly established in the Republicans' vocabulary when they began the attack against President Carter in the struggle for the White House, accusing him of "closing this window" [as published] by allegedly surrendering "military superiority" to the Soviet Union. For years this myth was used to intimidate taxpayers and to justify the Pentagon's mounting expenditure. After all, it has been calculated that ... $2 trillion have flown through this mythical "window." And not just anywhere but straight into the safes of the military-industrial complex, which it so happens had a hand in creating this myth. Military business even now is continuing to fuel it. The "window of vulnerability," it claims, has still not been closed. This recently gave rise to a heartfelt cry for Congressman Les Aspin (a Democrat from Wisconsin): "$2 trillion have been spent and the 'window of vulnerability' is still there. People! What have they done with the money?"

If you look at the international aspect of SDI, the whole thrust of the U.S. inequitable, great-power approach toward its allies is revealed here. On the one hand Washington is seeking to involve its "younger brothers" in NATO in the "star wars" program. But by no means to bestow sophisticated technology on them.

The Americans have a saying: "The only free cheese is in a mousetrap." Washington does not conceal the fact that all the scientific-technical achievements connected with SDI will remain under strict U.S. control while its allies have been prepared the fate of subcontractors, of "technological slaves."

And it is perfectly easy to understand the reaction of French President F. Mitterrand, who stated recently that he refuses to join in the implementation of the military space plan which "will in fact lead only to the intensification of international tension and put France in a subordinate position."

Only Britain, linked by "special interests," has attached itself to the U.S. SDI program (on the pretext of taking part in "research" work) and, as the press calls it, "the best student in the American school" -- Bonn. FRG Chancellor H. Kohl recently pushed through government the decision that FRG firms will take part in SDI. But even this "victory" may prove a Pyrrhic one. The broadest public circles are opposing "star wars" increasingly vigorously. In the FRG these include the Social Democrats, the Greens, the Communists, and other opposition circles. Nor is everything in harmony on this question among the ruling coalition. U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz was obviously dispatched to help the chancellor. He demanded that the Europeans stop hesitating and immediately associate themselves to the "star wars" plans, that is put their heads in the mousetrap which Washington calls the "defense initiative." Meanwhile, while G. Shultz was touring Europe, across the ocean, in his homeland, matters had not taken shape quite as the secretary of state and entire administration would have liked. For instance, in Washington recently the problems of reducing nuclear armaments were discussed by a group of specialists including several former government officials who had taken part in talks with the USSR. As the newspaper THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER notes, "all those taking part in the discussion of the question reached the unanimous opinion that the main obstacle to a new agreement (on strategic arms limitations -- T.K.) is President Reagan's adherence to the 'star wars' program which provides for the creation of an ABM defense system." A radical reduction of nuclear weapons which can reach the territories of the USSR and the United States is possible only on condition that space strike weapons are banned.

A month has elapsed since the Geneva meeting. A crucial period has now arrived. It is a case of practical deeds, of not undermining but developing everything useful achieved in Geneva. The Soviet leadership, as has been stated, is prepared to advance along this path. But this is not a one-way street. And we have the right to count on the same approach being displayed by the U.S. leadership. This would accord with the interests not only of the USSR and the United States but also of the entire world community.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

RELATED ISSUES

USSR 20 DECEMBER 'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD201915 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 20 Dec 85

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by foreign policy commentator Sergey Pravdin, with international affairs journalists Anatoliy Krasikov and Viktor Levin]

International Relations

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] How did relations within the world community as a whole develop during the past year?

[Krasikov] Well, it must be said that complications continue. Unfortunately, all the seats of international tension that arose during the preceding years remain. I have in mind, primarily, such regions as the Near East, Central America, southern Africa, and also many other points of the globe. The situation, unfortunately, is not getting any brighter as the leading country in the West, the United States, does not at all wish to give up its policy of force, or its attempts to impose on all countries and peoples a policy which is to Washington's liking.

But the most important and most acute questions which have worried, and continue to worry, the whole of mankind during the past year were and remain the questions of disarmament and strengthening international security.

Nuclear Test Moratorium

[Pravdin] The USSR is doing everything possible to strengthen peace and to avert the threat of nuclear war. In this connection, it is necessary to particularly stress the importance of the USSR's unilateral decision to establish a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Our listeners, as is shown by letters and telephone calls to the editorial office, have shown great interest in the report on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with Bernard Lown, U.S. cochairman of the international movement, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. As is known, during this meeting the U.S. professor gave a high assessment of the USSR's peaceful initiatives and, in particular, of the moratorium on all nuclear explosions announced on 6 August this year. The cessation of nuclear explosions, Lown said, is in accord with the hopes of all people.

Our regular listeners Mikhail Pavlovich Karshanov, and the Morzheyedov family from Moscow have written to the editorial office asking about what importance the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons would have. All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Levin replies to this question.

[Levin] First of all, I would like to remind you that when it introduced its moratorium on nuclear explosions on 6 August, the USSR appealed to the United States to follow our example. Our moratorium remains in effect until 1 January. During his conversation with Bernard Lown, Comrade Gorbachev said that we were ready to continue the moratorium that had been introduced by the USSR on nuclear explosions if the United States responded with reciprocity. Very little time remains until 1 January, but the unique opportunity to make the moratorium bilateral and to continue it further remains. To allow this chance to pass by, and here we come to the significance of the cessation. of nuclear weapon testing, would mean refusing to enter upon the path leading toward a final treaty banning all testing of nuclear weapons.

Consequently the USSR, and not only our country -- and one can say with complete certainty the whole world community -- I would remind you that a few days ago the UN General Assembly almost unanimously, with only three votes against -- and these were the votes of the United States, Britain and France -- adopted a resolution on the immediate cessation and banning of nuclear weapon tests. Thus, the USSR and the whole world community regard the moratorium on nuclear explosions as a step toward a total ban on nuclear weapon testing.

Now let us turn to the question of what mankind would obtain if nuclear explosions are stopped. Here, one should recall that an understanding was reached long ago between the USSR, the United States, and Britain on ceasing nuclear tests in three spheres: on the ground, under water, and in space. The USSR, in introducing a moratorium on carrying out nuclear explosions, proceeded from the genuine striving to make a real and concrete step along the path of improving the international political climate, along the path of strengthening peace. We took this step and the international public assessed it at its true worth. However, now, for the moratorium to be prolonged, what is needed is a similar decision from the United States. Our side is expected from the U.S. leadership a concrete and positive reply. Such a reply would have an extremely favourable influence on the whole situation.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

RELATED ISSUES

USSR 22 DECEMBER 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD222003 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 22 Dec 85

["International Observers Roundtable" with Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov; Political Observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin; and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political observer of Central Television and All-Union Radio]

Geneva Summit

[Excerpts]

[Tsvetov] Hello, Comrades. The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva was without doubt the main political event in the world during the past year. The influence of the Geneva spirit on the development of the international situation will be felt for a very long time to come, the more so in view of the fact that according to the accords reached in Geneva the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States plan to meet again next year. It is quite right, therefore, for us to begin the discussion of the International Observers Roundtable by talking about the significance of the Geneva meeting.

[Primakov] I would differ from you a little there. One cannot consider the Geneva meeting to be the main event of just this year alone. It is a very important event which might become a turning point in the development of the international situation. Geneva has enormous significance in that it creates definite prerequisites for improving the situation in the world, and the need for an improvement in this situation is perfectly obvious. However, some time has already gone by. How can one add up the results of the influence, the concrete influence, exerted by Geneva upon international events? I would of course begin with the fact that the public has clearly received the Geneva meeting in a thoroughly positive way, and in this respect one can talk about a certain breakthrough. It is much more difficult now to propagandize anti-Soviet slogans. It is much more difficult to propagandize delirious fabrications about the Soviet inclination toward war, so to speak, as was done in the past. It is much more difficult now to oppose existing agreements -- and in the West there are circles which are opposing them. It is much more difficult to do all of this. But at the same time can one say that the turning-point has already arrived whereby Western policies are dictated in the main by realistic motivation? I would not answer this question in that way.

[Shishlin] Yes, and unfortunately here, in my view, one has to cite a number of facts which lead one to the conclusion that what has been done so far is no more than the first steps; the greater part of the road to be covered lies ahead. And the road itself is evidently going to be very difficult and complicated. Yevgeniy Maksimovich has said that it is more difficult now to popularize anti-Soviet slogans and hostile fabrications of all kinds against Soviet policy, whether foreign or domestic. This is so. But nevertheless it is done. It is being done, and of course that putrid spiritual output which was so characteristic of the United States, and not just of the United States, is brought down in torrents upon public opinion; it is brought down in torrents upon people creating the kind of anti-Geneva psychological political climate, which, of course, suits extreme right-wing reactionary circles both within and outside of the United States. But this is only half the matter -- less than half the matter, even. For it is a fact that the ultraconservatives and the military-industrial complex in the United States have not let go of the threads they have been clinging to.

Nuclear Test Moratorium

[Shishlin] Speaking about the impulse that Geneva has given to the development of international relations and the tendencies which are already being shown after Geneva, I would like to say here, Vladimir Yakovlevich, that one cannot fail to pay attention to the fact that the United States is essentially passing over some unique opportunities to make a very serious and very perceptible contribution to reducing tension by responding to the Soviet goodwill example and introducing a moratorium on nuclear test explosions.

[Tsvetov] The Soviet Union brought to the Geneva talks a specific program for improving the international situation. One of the points in this program was the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. In order to ease the path toward this goal, the Soviet Union proposed an immediate freeze on nuclear armaments, and a complete ban, without a time limit, on tests of them; and this would be done under the most effective monitoring. As is known, the Soviet Union set an example of complete unity of word and action. On 6 August of this year it announced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union decided to uphold this moratorium unilaterally until 1 January 1986. But if the United States joins in the moratorium -- as you have already said, Nikolay Vladimirovich -- then the Soviet Union is willing to extend it.

[Shishlin] I would say that the United States has simply pressed along with its own line here, and has even made a point of being seen to be doing so. A few days ago it announced that it intended to carry out a very powerful test of a nuclear charge -- incidentally, it is 10 times more powerful then the nuclear charge which destroyed Hiroshima -- they are coupling this, in fact, with the programs for the Strategic Defense Initiative, or the "star wars" program, as we still call it, which remains almost the chief religion of the U.S. military-industrial complex and, indeed, of political circles in the United States today -- I am thinking of official political circles.

[Tsvetov] In connection with this I would like to remind the listeners why it is so important to halt nuclear tests; why it is that we have now been talking about it so much. Well, in the first place, thanks to the tests, the development [razrabotka] of more and more new and more improved kinds of nuclear weapons is taking place; their quality is being raised, so to speak, although this word sounds blasphemous in relation to weapons for mass destruction of the people. In the second place, testing enables vast nuclear arsenals to be maintained in constant readiness. If the individual components of this arsenal are not tested from time to time, then it is not known if these weapons are ready for use. And finally, in the third place, as you said, in its latest nuclear tests, the United States has tested lasers, which function by means of nuclear power. It is expected that these lasers would be used in the future "star wars." In this way it is clear how important it is to halt all nuclear explosions for the entire process of disarmament and for the process of relaxing the international situation. In the capacity of a barrier against concluding an agreement on halting all nuclear explosions, the U.S. side puts forward, as is well known, the claim that it is supposedly to verify the fulfillment of the undertaking on not carrying out nuclear explosions, especially the underground ones. But in the first place, there are national means fully sufficient for the detection of underground nuclear explosions. When a civil airliner with 520 passengers on board crashed in Japan at the end of summer, the seismic instruments recorded even this slight shift of soil, in comparison with a nuclear explosion. But if the U.S. side believes that national means of nuclear test detection are insufficient, then the Soviet Union is prepared to agree to the idea of using an international verification system. In order do this, it is possible, for instance, to utilize the proposal of six states concerning the establishment on their territories of special stations to observe fulfillment of the accord on the halting of tests. Which six states are these? They are Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania, and Sweden.

It means that these are the six countries whose leaders appealed to the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States to achieve an accord on the mutual halting of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union is ready to go even further: the Soviet Union supports the idea that if a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions were established at the present time, an accord with the United States could also be achieved on certain measures concerning on-site inspection in order to eliminate the possibility of doubts of adherence to this moratorium.

In concluding this topic of our discussion, I will remind our listeners about words spoken by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the meeting with Lown, the American cochairman of the International Movement of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. Comrade Gorbachev said: There still exists a unique opportunity to make the moratorium mutual and to extend it beyond 1 January. To drop this opportunity, paving the path toward a final ban, fixed by the treaty, on all nuclear-weapons tests, would be unwise, continued Comrade Gorbachev. The resolution of this issue is in the hands of the U.S. Government.

Results of Geneva

[Primakov] In summing up all that we have said, it seems to me that we are saying that everything was the same as before Geneva. I think that the question cannot be put in that way.

[Shishlin] Such a thesis would be incorrect.

[Primakov] The question cannot be put like that: Geneva has, of course, brought in certain changes. Geneva, of course, represents the most positive phenomenon of our life. And Geneva has led to a certain stratification in the camp of the opponents of detente. We can say that.

[Tsvetov] Absolutely right.

[Primakov] At the same time there is quite significant inertia in the policy of imperialist states, in the first place, in that of the United States. Of course, realism in this policy has not yet acquired the upper hand. We shall hope that it will, all the same, get the upper hand, because the situation is already too dangerous. If it is left to spontaneity, if all continues as it did prior to Geneva, then we will soon approach the boundary of the crossing beyond which lie vast, most terrible, and tragic consequences for mankind. Therefore, it seems to me that it was not reasonable to expect that Geneva would at once lead to colossal changes and that the United States would give up its policy toward the Soviet Union and other countries.

[Tsvetov] Yes, Yevgeniy Maksimovich; allow me to interrupt you. You have quite correctly said that it is impossible to consider that Geneva yielded nothing. It seems to me that it brought about what is in the present stage the only possibility, namely the acknowledgement that in the nuclear epoch we can either live together or die together. It is this acknowledgement, it seems to me, that has been penetrating the minds of many people in the West, including the United States.

[Primakov] It has even given something more.

[Tsvetov] Yes.

[Primakov] I would not confine myself to that alone. Geneva has made it possible for everybody to realize that a solution can be found; this is the main thing, do you understand?

Prior to this, very many people doubted that a solution was possible. And here a solution has been found; for instance, a definite coming together of positions has taken place, which was expressed in the official declaration that nuclear war has to be avoided. But this is not the only thing; there is also the fact that both sides have undertaken a definite pledge not to strive to military superiority over each other. This in itself is a new element. Of course, the implementation of this element is another thing. But the prerequisites for the implementation have improved. And even though Nikolay Vladimirovich talked about their [as heard] continuing to work on public opinion, pouring onto it new masses, so to speak, of propagandist criticism against the Soviet Union and so on, I, however, think, that public opinion itself is less pliable. They are doing all this again, but I do not think that they are as successful as before.

[Tsvetov] Excuse me, I would like in connection with this to say that in the last ediction of a very serious U.S. journal, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, a lengthy article by George Kennan, a well-known U.S. expert in politics, has been published. I would like to bring to your attention a highly interesting quotation from this article. Kennan writes: Since man differs from other animals by such characteristics as his understanding of himself, his keeping of his own history and his ability to create great beauty, would it not perhaps be a blasphemy to risk all of this solely for the sake of the comforts, the fears, and the national rivalry of one single generation of people, no matter what kind of god any particular individual believes in? This means that the author of the article absolutely and unambiguously demonstrates that he is in favor or our living together and not dying together. And in order to reach this in practical terms, Soviet U.S. relations have to be based on the unalterable principle of identical security for both sides. In other words, strategic parity has to represent a natural conditon of mutual relations.

[Shishlin] I would like to add to what was said here the following: I fully share the view that after Geneva the situation has changed. It has changed not simply in its moral and psychological quality. It has also changed in its political quality. At the same time, the changes in the Soviet U.S. sphere may be less significant: Nevertheless, there have been changes. There was the arrival of a large group of representatives of U.S. business in the Soviet Union; there is the fact that we are beginning to see the outlines of the implementation of this general agreement on contacts in the sphere of science, education, and culture, which was signed by the Soviet foreign minister and U.S. secretary of state; and other things are being done in practical areas of Soviet-U.S. contacts.

East-West Dialogue

In particular, some progress at the Stockholm Conference is noticeable; there are the outlines of a quite broad agreement on new measures of confidence; and binding declarations on the nonuse of force and on renouncing of its use are similarly in sight. However, Geneva also provided quite a powerful impetus to the development of mutual relations which it is the custom to call relations between East and West. And I think that the East-West dialogue itself has been noticeably intensifying, and not only in the East-West direction, but at the same time in the direction East-East, too. I know that Yevgeniy Maksimovich has returned from Japan, and I am absolutely certain that the Japanese have been asking him continuously: How will Geneva influence Soviet-Japanese relations? Was it like this?

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

MOSCOW REPORTS ANTIWAR GROUP COCHAIRMEN NEWS CONFERENCE

LD200018 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 19 Dec 85

[News conference by cochairmen of "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" Soviet Academician Yevgeniy Chazov and U.S. Professor Bernard Lown at the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences in Moscow on 18 December with TASS correspondent Biryukov and other unidentified questioners; Lown statements in English with superimposed Russian translation throughout -- video recorded]

[Excerpts] [Chazov] I suggest that the first to speak should be Professor Bernard Lown, cochairman of the movement and the man who was largely behind the organization of the international movement, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

[Lown] Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Eight days ago we had the honor of being presented with the highest award for work to strengthen peace on earth, the Nobel Peace Prize. We met Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. This meeting lasted more than 2 and 1/2 hours.

We discussed the aims our movement pursues and the difficulties it is coming up against.

We have succeeded in persuading many people both in the West and East to join our movement. What is the explanation for our success? Above all, it is the fact that I believe we have set up an organization of doctors which has no political bias, an organization which makes no accusations against any country, and which merely sets out the facts, attempting to avoid ideological pitfalls and the ideological phraseology that is the constant attribute of the cold war. We are an organization that involves itself with no other matters, with one exception: the paramount question of defending the basic right of everyone on earth, the right to life. That is the position to which we subscribe and which we shall defend.

[Chazov] I would like to make a few more additional points to what Professor Lown said in order to anticipate certain questions which might arise. Journalists frequently ask us what we have actually achieved, what the movement has in fact achieved. I would like, literally very briefly, to recall with you what things were like, what views were in existence at the time when our movement began. There were many nuclear illusions: the belief that a nuclear war could be won, that there could be a winner in a nuclear war, that a limited nuclear war could be waged, and that there are more important things than peace. You know that at Geneva U.S. President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev indicated in their communique that a nuclear war must not be waged and that there can be no winner in a nuclear war.

The people who were the first to show, on the basis of figures and precise scientific data, that a nuclear war means the destruction of life on earth were doctors. They were the first to give an example of how it is possible for people of different nationalities, political views, and religions to tackle this critical problem facing mankind together.

[Lown] We doctors believe that the most logical first step must be taken. This is our so-called medical prescription, a step which requires neither verification or control--namely, halting the creation of new armaments and the improvement of nuclear weapons. Such a step would give neither side advantages and at the same time, would put an end to the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. This step is supported by all peoples. In 1979 it was already partially effected by our two countries.

We now believe that an important first step would be the halting of nuclear weapons tests, something which would signal the start of a process of halting the arms race. In this sense, we, as a movement, support all sensible initiatives directed at this goal. In this connection, we warmly thanked Mr Gorbachev for the important initiative undertaken by the Soviet Union in August of this year when your country unilaterally halted all nuclear weapon tests. We proposed to him that this moratorium should be extended further in the future.

Mr Gorbachev replied to us that national means of control exist today which make it possible to detect a 1 kiloton nuclear blast both from the Soviet and U.S. side. The USSR, he stressed, backs the proposal of six countries concerning the exercise of control over the halting of tests. We, he said, back both general control and local control. He also said that the USSR was ready now, that is today, to sign an agreement with the United States on the universal banning of nuclear tests in order not to continue these tests in the future. Let me now reply to your questions.

[Correspondent] Did the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee give you any promise about a unilateral extension of the validity of the moratorium on nuclear weapons tests?

[Lown] He said the Soviet Union had already done its bit. Now, so to speak, it is up to the U.S. side to make the next move.

[Biryukov] Biryukov from TASS. I would like to hear a few words about your attitude as a doctor to the "star wars" program being drawn up in the United States.

[Lown] We subscribe to the view that we doctors are not military experts, but all the same, like anyone alse, we have common sense. This common sense dictates to us that the arms race should be halted both on earth, in the heavens, and in space. At its two latest annual congresses, our movement voted against the extension of the arms race to space.

[Correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] A question from an NBC correspondent. Are you not disappointed, Mr Chazov, by the negative reaction on the pary of certain Western countries in connection with the fact that you were awarded the Nobel Prize?

[Chazov] First, I would like to say that the Nobel Prize was not awarded to me personally or Lown personally. It was awarded to 140,000 doctors throughout the world. Second, I do not believe that this was a reaction against me on the part of whole cities, but a reaction by certain circles. I am a doctor and I always go to the root of things, examining the causes. I have been to the United States many times, many times over these years. I have a very large number of scientist frieds. During this time, I was elected honorary member of a very large number of societies and universities and I am coordinator of Soviet-U.S. research, official Soviet-U.S. research in the medical field. The conclusion I draw from this is that this is not an attack against me. Our movement represents a great force. People in the world pay a lot attention to what we have to say. The spirit of Geneva has now emerged. This spirit of Geneva is the spirit of cooperation, the spirit of discussion between East and West. There are some people who do not like this and they want to destroy this spirit from the very start. I think this is both an attack on us and an attack on the spirit of Geneva.

[Correspondent] Soviet television. I have a question for Professor Lown. I would like to know what steps you, Professor Lown, your colleagues, and the scientific community of the United States in general, can take to create a more friendly climate, a more constructive atmosphere, in order to ensure the process of improving Soviet-U.S. relations continues.

[Lown] I agree that a great influence on relations between our countries is exerted by the stereotypes we ourselves have created, based on ignorance or misconceptions about one another. That is why we doctors are carrying out very interesting and very important work in this sense. For instance, we organize reciprocal visits to each other's countries. So my belief is that the key to the whole thing if the establishment of relations between people, it is our common effort to strengthen mutual understanding.

[Unidentified speaker in English] Thank you very much, dear friends.

[Unidentified speaker] Thank you, that is the end of the news conference.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1207

END